

MILITARY CHAPLAINS'

REVIEW

1972

MILITARY CHAPLAINS'

REVIEW

VOL. 1, NO. 3



AUGUST, 1972

PREFACE

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research. We welcome articles which are directly concerned with supporting and strengthening chaplains professionally. Preference will be given to those articles having lasting value as reference material.

The *Military Chaplains' Review* is published quarterly. The opinions reflected in each article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Chief of Chaplains or the Department of the Army.

Articles should be submitted in duplicate, double spaced, to the Editor, Military Chaplains' Review, United States Army Chaplain Board, Fort George G. Meade, Maryland 20755. Articles should be approximately 5 to 30 pages in length and, when appropriate, should be carefully footnoted.

Use of funds for printing of this publication has been approved by Headquarters, Department of the Army, 7 September 1971.

IN THIS ISSUE

We live in a rapidly changing world; almost everything is in a state of flux. Many of us are interested in encouraging *beneficial* change—in American society, in the military and in the chaplaincy. One way we promote healthy change is in our daily pastoral ministry with individuals and groups. Another way is in our administrative work where we often attempt to make the structures of the military more responsive to its mission and the needs of its people. A third way is through the ideas and judgments contained in the *Military Chaplains' Review*, which can function as a progressive, long-range catalyst for salutary change as chaplains reflect on the authors' opinions—either to adopt or reject them.

In the first article of this issue Dr. Howard J. Clinebell gives some pertinent advice on how to do crisis counseling with drug-dependent persons, as well as with persons having many other kinds of problems. His advice is offered within the context of understanding the total problem of drug abuse and the unique contribution which chaplains can make in helping people with this or any other problem. Chaplain (LTC) Benjamin E. Smith also writes on this subject. He emphasizes that chaplains must take special steps to *prepare themselves* to be of service in this area of human suffering.

The next two articles deal with the *role* of the chaplain. Chaplain (COL) Thomas A. Harris uses the concepts *prophet*, *jester* and *jerk* in developing his ideas of where chaplains fail—and where they can succeed in their ministry. Although Chaplain Harris is concerned with the hospital chaplaincy in particular, his ideas can be applied in other areas of ministry as well. Chaplain (MAJ) Clinton E. Grenz, in an article on his "industrial" chaplaincy program at the Sacramento Army Depot, discusses his work with authorized civilian personnel there. He describes it as an on-post supplement to the ministries of local churches.

Dr. Charles R. Stinnette discusses the various ways in which people develop from infants to adults and relates these ways to the growth of religion in people's lives. The more we comprehend persons' "modes of becoming," the better we will be able to meet their deepest needs.

In the final article Dr. Earl H. Furgeson challenges chaplains to take their preaching ministry seriously. It is his contention that preaching is in a state of crisis, that it is in danger of

being taken captive by the cultural situation. "The jaundiced condition of preaching," he states, "can be cured by any preacher who is willing to pay the cost of the medicine."

The preface to this issue states that the *Military Chaplains' Review* "is designed as a medium in which those interested in the military chaplaincy can share with chaplains the product of their experience and research." All chaplains are encouraged to write. In particular, chaplains who are now studying for advanced degrees and attending various professional schools should seriously consider submitting their most relevant papers for publication.

GERHARDT W. HYATT
Chaplain (Major General) USA
Chief of Chaplains

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW—VOL. 1, NO. 3
August, 1972

Articles:

	Page
Understanding and Counseling the Drug Dependent Person Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Ph.D.	1
Preparing to Minister to the Drug Dependent Person Chaplain (LTC) Benjamin E. Smith	13
The Chaplain: Prophet, Jester or Jerk Chaplain (COL) Thomas A. Harris	21
An Army "Industrial" Chaplaincy Model Chaplain (MAJ) Clinton E. Grenz	31
Religion and the Modes of Becoming Charles R. Stinnette, Jr., Ph.D.	35
Where is Preaching Today? Earl H. Furgeson, Ph.D.	53
Historical Notes	65

UNDERSTANDING AND COUNSELING THE DRUG DEPENDENT PERSON

Rev. Howard J. Clinebell, Jr., Ph.D.

I would like to do three things in the next few minutes. First, I would like to talk a little about the context of *understanding* the problem of drug abuse. Second, I want to describe something of a methodology of *counseling* which we use with people who are hooked on drugs, as well as with many other kinds of people. And, third, I want to talk about the *unique contribution of the clergyman* in the area of counseling the drug dependent person.

UNDERSTANDING THE PROBLEM OF DRUG ABUSE

I believe that we will get nowhere in helping any person with a problem until we begin to see it from his perspective—from the standpoint of *his perceptual set*. I would like to talk about this for a little while in terms of my understanding of the perceptual set of the counter-culture, particularly the perceptual set of the younger group of drug abusers.

I was shaving the other morning and as I did I was listening to the news and I heard this seductive, sultry female voice come over the airwaves. It turned out to be an advertisement for the phone company. The voice said: "With us you are more than a name; you are a number." Our culture's trend toward depersonalization is part of the understanding of drug use by youth and by older people. This is a world where many people feel depersonalized—they feel more like numbers than names.

The second crucial thing about the world is that we live on the verge of an awesome threshold—the age of psychochemistry. We know that people in almost all known cultures have used mind-altering chemicals of one kind or another. Alcohol has been man's oldest tranquilizer, with marijuana a close runner-up. But the thing that is really new about our current scene is that due to the marvels of chemistry we now have a whole array of new mind-altering chemicals which can change inner space. Frankly, we as theologians haven't done our homework. By that I mean we haven't provided people with any kinds of sound guidelines for distinguishing responsible from irresponsible uses of even

Dr. Clinebell is Professor of Pastoral Counseling at the School of Theology, Claremont, California. Among his books are *Understanding and Counseling the Alcoholic*, *Mental Health Through Christian Community*, *Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling*, *Intimate Marriage*, with Charlotte H. Clinebell, and *The People Dynamic: Changing Self and Society Through Growth Groups*. This article is a speech presented last year to chaplains attending the Sixth Army Chaplains' Conference.

the oldest of mind-altering chemicals—alcohol. Now we face this tremendous challenge of a whole new array of consciousness-changing chemicals with a great deal of ambivalence, inner conflict, and confusion (ethical and otherwise) about what actually constitute legitimate ways of living in a world where these chemicals are here to stay.

The pharmaceutical companies already have on their shelves, or soon will have, drugs that can produce almost any desired mental state. I suppose it's just a question of time until these drugs are readily available through the druggist. It's conceivable that before too many years, you will be able to go to your medicine cabinet in the morning and decide what kind of day you want to have. If you want a day when you feel good, you take pill A; if you want a sexy day, you take pill B; or a religious day, pill C; and so forth. What I'm talking about here, of course, is that 1984 is arriving ahead of schedule and that we in the church have a tremendous challenge to provide guidelines for constructive living; since drugs are here to stay, the real challenge is to help people learn how to live sanely and constructively *with* drugs. Incidentally, to distinguish the more or less responsible use or nonuse of alcohol would be a good place to start.

Another fact about our world which is helpful in understanding the world of drug use is that adults, not youth, are the main drug abusers in our culture. According to a sociological study made recently, one fourth of all adults use mind-altering chemicals—psychoactive chemicals to wake up, go to sleep or gain some semblance of inner tranquility. We live in a drug-saturated culture, where millions of middle-aged people reach the value crisis of those years (that Carl Jung talked about) and discover that they have a profound emptiness within. Drugs help them forget their emptiness for a time and find a semblance of the relationships for which they hunger.

Another fact about our world is that it is polarized. The generation gap is actually a value chasm. I would like to try to describe this in terms of drawing a line down the middle of a blackboard. Let's say that on the left hand side of the line you put the values that the counter-culture regards as important. These are the values of drug-using youths. On the right hand side—and I choose the sides after some consideration—let me list the values of middle class establishment types which most of us here represent. I think if you realize the truth in this kind of approach, and this is not original, you will see the inherent problem in counseling with a drug user who is from the youth center culture.

Let's start by asking what kinds of values are important for

youth in the counter-culture. Let's start by recognizing that *pleasure* is an inherent value. Pleasure is good in itself for these youth. Parallel on the right side of the line would be another very different kind of value—*productivity*, or work. On the youth side there is emphasis on the *now*! This is the *now* generation. The emphasis is on living *now* because one can never be quite sure if there will be a future; *now* is the moment that the youth generation is most concerned about. This stands in radical contrast to the value that most of us place on the *future*. Post-poning gratifications, for example, making sacrifices to go to school, is part of our life style. Our kind of thinking, with an emphasis on the value of the past and future, is very different from the *now* orientation of the youth culture.

The older way of looking at things has placed an emphasis on the value of *rationality*. One of the interesting things about the counter-culture is the tremendous spiritual search which has become part of this whole way of life. I would say that a kind of *mystical longing* is basic here, and the sort of head-level religion which has been most available in our churches has very little appeal to the young person who seeks to satisfy his spiritual heart-hungers (perhaps as a Jesus freak or in the instant transcendence of drugs). The older mentality places an emphasis on *security*. For example, "Don't use drugs—they might hurt you!" This sounds perfectly logical to a person living on the right side of the line; but to youth, living on the left side of the line, where *risk*, not security is valued, this is not a convincing argument against using drugs. We have often gotten fouled up about the meaning of religion and probably have been closer to the pharisees than to the young carpenter who enjoyed people and feasting so much that he was accused by his enemies of being a winebibber and glutton.

In contrast to our emphasis on work and duty, there is an emphasis in the youth culture on experiencing, pleasuring, living. They believe that you can never really buy back with money the life, the fun, the joy, the freedom you sold to get that money.

There is a whole new attitude toward *authority* among youth. The old authority was *attributive authority*—authority which was granted to a person because of his station or status or title, or something else. And, for many young people, this kind of authority doesn't count for much any more. But there is a new kind of authority, the *authority of competence*; this is the authority possessed by a person who knows something and can do something that is important to society—that does make a lot of difference to youth. They respect that. But the whole attitude toward

institutions and toward attributive authority is disappearing very rapidly among the young.

On the adult side, we put aggressive values—values like *competition, getting ahead, making something of yourself*. On the youth side, we might put the passive values—values like *love and peace*. The slogan of the hippie generation, “Make love, not war,” has a deep philosophical meaning at this point. In terms of sex ethics, the dual standard of adults, male and female, has been replaced among many youth by a single standard.

As people of religious dedication, our job is to be bridge builders. If you feel as I do, that there are important values on both sides of the line—in the passive as well as the aggressive virtues—then it seems to me that our job in the church is to be bridge builders between the counter culture and the adult culture.

A METHODOLOGY OF COUNSELING

Let me talk a bit about a second general area, namely, a methodology of counseling based on this approach to understanding the drug scene. This approach to counseling is not the one based on psychotherapy as a model. I discovered as a parish minister and a hospital chaplain that the model of counseling that I learned in seminary—Rogers with a dash of Freud—wasn't very functional for a lot of reasons. In the twenty years since I graduated from seminary there has been a metamorphosis of my approach to counseling. I think it has freed me to use myself better and to be more effective in helping people on a *short term, action-oriented* approach. The model of counseling I would like to describe which works best with drug-dependent people is based on *reality therapy* à la William Glasser. It's an action-oriented approach, a short term approach based also on the crisis intervention theory of Gerald Caplan, who is at Harvard in the School of Community Mental Health. It's an approach which assumes that you don't have to know how a fire started to put it out, that the personality is like a muscle that gets stronger if you exercise it and weaker if you don't. It's an approach based on responsible living. It assumes that if you live responsibly, the chances are good that your self esteem will go up.

The psychotherapeutic model, in contrast, assumed that the way you change a person's behavior was by changing his self image. You help him deal with his feelings, his attitudes, his basic orientation toward himself, other people and life. And if once he gets to a more positive self-affirming attitude, then his behavior, his relationships, his marriage will change. It's a great theory, but the problem is that it doesn't always work. Many people who have been in long term psychotherapy, for example,

have changed their attitudes in significant ways, but still hold on to old behavior patterns. What reality therapy and crisis intervention methodologies of counseling do is to turn this right around and say that a person can begin to change his behavior in constructive directions, and if he does, then his attitudes, his self esteem, his relationships will probably begin to improve.

Perhaps it wouldn't be amiss to review the basic questions one asks in reality therapy. There are three or four of them. They go like this. The first question is, "What do you really want?" What do *you* want?" Not, "What do *I* want?" as a chaplain or a parish clergyman. Until we find that out about the drug-using person, we don't have any place to go with him. We can talk till we're blue in the face about what he *should* want, but there won't be a counseling relationship. We're dealing here with the whole issue of motivation. I remember the story of the woman who stood up in the mid-week prayer meeting and said, "Young people ought to be *made* to do what's right and do it willingly." Of course, this is the bind not only with young people but also with older people.

I would expect that as the Army becomes more and more volunteer, the whole problem of drug abuse, the types and degree of drug abuse, will change for the better. I predict this because many of the negative factors which now exist will be eliminated. So find out what the person wants. The first question: "What do you want?" If you can tie in to a person where he is and discover what he *wants out of life*, then you've got some leverage. Second, "What are you *doing* now?" Third, "Is what you're doing now getting you what you want?" Fourth, "What do you have to change about your behavior, your relationships, your life style, in order to get what you want?"

Of course the question in the second interview is, "What happened when you tried it?" The next question is, "So if it didn't work, are you willing to re-commit yourself to get what you really want out of life?" Now this is basically an over-simplification of reality therapy. It's amazing how well it works, provided that we have a relationship with that person based on an understanding of his inner world.

The most important thing in counseling is not techniques, although frankly a conceptual model like reality therapy can free a pastor to be more effective. If it can free you not to moralize, because moralizing is futile, particularly with people who are addicted, it will help you meet the person at his point of need, so that the person says, "No. Life is not giving me what I want."

A psychiatric social worker I know works with many delinquent drug-using teenagers. She has one girl, seventeen and sleep-

ing around in a careless, self-damaging way. Everybody has lectured her. Everyone has told her how dangerous it is. She already knew most of this before anyone told her, by the way. The counselor is beginning to get through to this girl by asking her what she really wants. This girl is beginning to face the self-destructive consequences of her irresponsible behavior (V.D., abortion, hurtful relationships); she has a new basis for planning her own change goals and deciding how to reach them.

The minute we begin to *relate* to young people who are members of the counter-culture, the minute we begin to *listen* to them, it's amazing what happens. Not very many adults really listen to young people. Once we begin to listen, we begin to hear their wistful longings about the future. If you can listen and relate, you can discover what kind of future a person wants. Then you can help him plan the steps he must take to get from A to B, with A being where he is now and B being where he wants to be. Then you're on his team, you're on his side. You're not manipulating him, you're not trying to push him into a mold or fit him into a "dehumanizing establishment." You are, in fact, a friend, an ally in getting what he wants. (A part of your job is to help him look at the probable consequences of what he *thinks* he wants to make sure it is *really* what he wants.)

The model of counseling I am suggesting starts where people are, and it builds on their own motivation, the drive to realize their own God-given potentialities. Many drug-abusing people are misusing drugs as a response to the tragedy, the pain, the uncertainty and the confusing social changes and widespread injustices of our times.

For many people life is like "a prolonged surgical operation without the benefit of anesthesia." The reason alcoholics drink so much is because they hurt so much. For this same reason, many people use other forms of mind-changing drugs. The reason I mention this is because it seems to me that in terms of discovering our unique role as clergy-counselors, the only place to start is with genuine compassion. The thing that the person from the counter-culture expects from us is critical judgment. Not compassion. Let me suggest a way of getting at this in terms of those hard, cold lumps—those mini-icebergs in our souls—called judgmentalism. Jesus was free of these and this allowed him to accept the unacceptable—society's rejects. Let me suggest that instead of talking about drug abusers as *those people out there*, that we talk about the ways *we* use to dim reality, to take some of the pain away, to reduce an awareness of the absurdity, the tragedy of our lives and our society.

There are many ways of doing this. Work addiction is one

way. I like Art Buchwald's column entitled, "If there's a cure for work addiction, it doesn't work." Work addiction is the two-briefcase syndrome. The dynamics of work addiction are very close to drug addiction—the same craving, for example. Buchwald tells about how his wife locked up his typewriter one weekend, so that she could relate to him, and he began to crave just a little chance to get back to the keyboard. "Just one sheet of paper, dear." Now work addiction is a socially rewarded way of escaping from reality, of making an ultimate out of that which is less than ultimate—work. It's a way of dying of a cardiac condition in your mid-forties and being rewarded socially by people saying, "My, isn't it marvelous how he worked himself to death."

Another socially approved form of escape from reality is food addiction. This is called spoon-in-mouth disease. It is psychodynamically very similar to all other forms of addiction. One finds himself looking around to see who's watching before he goes to the ice box. He knows the same rationalization process as the alcoholic, the same sneaking and hiding of food.

Compulsive religion is another form of addiction—people who can't choose freely to practice their religion or not. They can't just be children of God, but are *driven* by some kind of inner compulsion to be "religious." These are people for whom the term *freedom in Christ* has no meaning at a deep level. These are people who know not the truth that makes men free.

These are all forms of addiction (and there are many more); what I am suggesting is that you start with yours and that Clinebell start with his. If we do this we are less apt to fall into the trap of pointing the finger only at the people *out there* who are drug abusers and forgetting that most of us have our favorite addictions (including mind-changing drugs) also.

The place to start is where you are, with your own ways of dealing with reality. The thing that keeps us from being effective with people who are "social deviants" is that we are perceived (by them) as sitting on a pedestal of self-righteousness. Even if we aren't it takes some doing to get off that pedestal in their eyes. What I'm suggesting is that there is at least some need in us to sit on a pedestal and one way to get off is to start with your own pain and your own problems.

A few weeks ago, I was reflecting on this and thinking about some painful experiences of my own life. I would like to share the thought that hit me: It's about pain. "Pain, yours, your own personal hurt, your private crunch. How you use it builds bridges or barriers; it either connects you with another person's pain, his dark world, his agony, or it keeps you living alone behind your shell, your shell of make-believe which says, 'Look, I'm

adequate, I'm up on top, I'm in control, I'm invulnerable.' Why waste your pain?"

Well, let's talk a little about what you have going for you and what I have going for me as clergymen in drug counseling. I think all of us are aware of some of the things the psychotherapist, the mental health expert, can do in the field of drug addiction. But the tendency to lump all persons who misuse drugs into the category of having deep psychopathology is an error because it points us in the wrong way in seeking workable solutions. Drug use by counter-culture youth is as often a normal expression of the counter-culture as it is a sign of psychopathology.

What I mean by this is that the use of drugs, such as marijuana by the youth culture, frequently is a sign of *belonging* to that culture. It serves the same purpose for the youth culture today that beer did for many during prohibition. We must recognize, however, that there is a percentage of young people who use grass and a smaller percentage who get hooked on the hard drugs like heroin, and who misuse the barbiturate groups—who misuse the hallucinogenic drugs, particularly the powerful ones like LSD—who do so because of underlying personality disturbances. These young people need therapy. But the psychotherapeutic approach will not work if drug use is a *sociological expression* rather than a symptom of some deep psychopathology.

An editorial in the Palo Alto paper yesterday contained a very insightful statement about the soldiers who are coming back from Vietnam. It said that there are really three factors which probably contribute to the five and one-half percent of the people who are coming back who have, through urine analyses, been identified as having some heroin in their blood streams. First, the availability of the drug, second, the special stresses that they are under, including peer encouragement to use the drug, and third, the underlying psychological problems or hang-ups. A doctor, a surgeon from the Department of Defense, points out that two of these causes will be removed once they get back in so-called normal American life. I think it's reasonable to expect—and there is no way to predict this, because as the editorial writer said, it takes at least a year to know if a person is really off heroin, is really going to stay off—that when the availability of a high quality supply is removed and when the special stresses of loneliness and danger are removed, that many of these young people will not have the underlying soil of addiction, that is, the psychopathology, the hang-ups, which will make them crave the sort of special mind alteration of drugs strongly enough to

defy society and to risk their own health and welfare to continue drug use.

In other words, to go back to reality therapy for a moment, what they want out of life in *other* directions will be strong enough to help counteract the alluring effect of drugs. Incidentally, in drug education, I think it's very important to tell honestly what drugs do *for* people, as well as what they do *to* people. There is good research evidence from social psychology that one-sided "preventive" education doesn't really prevent much when people find out that it's a half-truth. What I'm also saying is that we should be quite candid and honest, that the vigilante literature in the drug field, the big scare approach, accomplishes not only nothing, it accomplishes less than nothing in the sense that when young people discover that they have not been told the truth—for example, that marijuana could do something *for* you as well as *to* you—then the credibility gap becomes impossibly wide.

THE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION OF THE CLERGYMAN

Let's look more closely now at the unique role of the clergyman as drug counselor. Religion and the whole philosophical dimension are crucial in seeking a positive alternative. Take alcoholism as an example. Have you ever stopped to think that in all the long, dark, abysmal history of the mistreatment of alcoholics throughout the centuries, the most hopeful approach ever devised is essentially a spiritual approach—Alcoholics Anonymous? I don't think any of the social scientists who have studied the problem have really come up with a satisfying or adequate answer as to why this is so. To me the answer is in the general direction of words of "The Late Liz," Gertrude Behanna, an amazing woman who had a head-on encounter with the Holy Spirit in the midst of her alcoholism and became a transformed person. She said, in effect, "When I drank, it wasn't that I was trying to escape *from* something, I was trying to get *to* something, a land of larger dimensions."

As persons educated in religion, I think we can understand that. It is the search *for* something that is often involved in that which is defined by society as a "misuse" of drugs. This means that in terms of preventing drug abuse and also in treating it, we clergymen have a number of unique, important functions. First of all we need to provide opportunities for people to have experiences of transcendence without drugs; everyone, in order to stay mentally healthy, needs a robust spiritual dimension to his life. A young alcoholic in New York said to me, "Howard, when I drink it's like I'm searching for a beautiful

country. I'm on the verge of it; I never quite make it, but I keep trying." William James in his tremendously insightful Gifford lectures said about drunkenness, "Not through mere perversity do men run after it." You remember that his discussion of drunkenness was in the chapter on mysticism in his *Varieties of Religious Experiences*. It seems to me that we need to re-emphasize the vertical dimension, the mystical dimension of people's lives, and as clergymen, help people discover vital vertical experiences. People will find these experiences in various ways. Many will find them in corporate worship services.

Some of us also will find them in deep experiences of nature. I've just come back from a week of back-packing with two of my children in the high Sierras. The tremendous feeling of being there, of camping by a beautiful lake at 10,000 feet, of those great granite cliffs towering above, was one of these vertical experiences for me. It seems to me that some of these deep experiences of the vertical can be obtained by people who really sense that truly the earth *is* the Lord's, that this is the process through which he works.

Some people find it in relationships. Perhaps this is the best place to find it. A couple told about standing beneath a gray, leadened, November sky on a hill in the Middle West. They were married and still in love, looking up all alone at the sky and listening— as a jagged V of wild geese honked along across the sky. For them it was the moment of transcendence! If we're looking for positive alternatives to drug use, we as pastors need to help people discover more of these moments of transcendence.

I think that, second, we need to realize that there is a *value crisis* in our culture, that many things that your grandfather was very sure about, you are not very sure about if you are a typical modern man. We don't need to feel guilty about this; it's a product of our period of rapid social change. As one of the great sociologists of our time has said, there was more change in the first five decades of this century than in the previous five centuries. And there has been more change in the last decade, the 60's, than in the first five decades of this century. The speed of social change is accelerating. Institutions are becoming obsolete. This requires creativity in the whole area of values and styles of ministry. I would like to suggest that helping people grow mature consciences is part of the way of coping with the drug scene. By mature consciences I mean the ability to make one's own decisions or, to put it differently, to be able to use one's God-given rational capacity fully in making the complicated ethical decisions that adults face.

What this means is that all the ex-cathedra ways of approach-

ing ethics and morality are going to be less and less viable for modern man. Perhaps for the first time in human history we have a chance to create adults in the area of morality, adults who respond to the good life because it is the good life. They'll know it's good because it's self-validating. They'll know that when they behave in a certain way, their marriage gets better or their friendships get deeper. They'll communicate better. As a theologically trained counselor, you are the only counseling professional who is trained to deal in a disciplined, systematic way with issues of value. If the crisis of the human race today is to a large extent a value crisis, the clergyman has an indispensable function in this whole area. I'm suggesting, then, that we must try to give people experiences of value dimension.

Thirdly, we must help people find ways of *deepening their relationships with each other*. A letter written by a high school senior, a girl who is a very active church member in her church, speaks to this point. She's a straight A student, a very beautiful girl, the kind that all of us would be delighted to have as a daughter. She writes: "Looking back at my experience both with drugs and our growth groups, I realize that unknowingly I was in search of love and humanness. Society and its demands are so cold, narrow, materialistic and status oriented I wish more people could be turned on to the small groups like in our church. I have found myself happier since I have found this type of warmth and love. I can get really high on nature and books and music, and most of all people. It's beautiful."* She also reports that since she has gotten connected with people she has had no desire to use drugs.

CONCLUSION

Let me say in closing that I think the basic issue is *life*—that the *quality* of life is where it's at. People who are really turned on to people can take drugs or leave them. They won't use drugs in a self-destructive way, since they are turned on to life. If they aren't turned on to life, then they will tend to misuse not only drugs but work, food, religion, booze and lots of other things.

For me the issue is essentially religious, you see. After all, isn't this where religion is? Isn't this the purpose of religion? The prophet Jeremiah put it this way, "This day I've set before you two ways, one leading toward life and one toward death." Erich Fromm, one of the modern prophets, put it as follows in a book

*For a further discussion of the how and why of growth groups, see Dr. Clinebell's book *The People Dynamic: Changing Self and Society Through Growth Groups* (Harper and Row, Feb 1972).

called *Psychoanalysis and Zen Buddhism*. He said, "The aim of life is to be fully born. The tragedy is that most of us die before we are thus born."

When we are connected to God, to ourselves and to nature, we don't have to worry about drugs, either in terms of prevention or treatment. It's my feeling that there is no treatment that is complete unless people are turned on to life in this sense, that no punitive approach will work in the final analysis unless we have these positive alternatives, including the deepest one which is helping people find a philosophy of life, a set of values, and a relationship with other people and with the God that works for them. The issue is *life*.

Our job as ministers, rabbis and priests is to turn people on to *life* and all its fullness. And when we do that, we are being the church, we are being the temple, we are creating a therapeutic, healing, growth-stimulating community in which people can find this quality of life. When that happens we don't have to worry about drugs. Drugs will take care of themselves because people will feel like people. They will feel like *children of God*.

PREPARING TO MINISTER TO THE DRUG DEPENDENT PERSON

Chaplain (LTC) Benjamin E. Smith

INTRODUCTION

The chaplain's vocation includes ministering to people who need help. This clearly calls for a willingness to use the skills of knowledge and experience that are available to him. In addition, he must have a working knowledge of the known facts about the problem area that requires his ministry. Because the problem of widespread drug abuse is comparatively new in our society, the chaplain must take special steps to prepare himself to be of service in this area of human suffering. This means that the chaplain must carefully identify his role and function in relationship to the drug dependent person, as well as becoming familiar with the known facts about the problem of drug abuse in the military community.

There is growing recognition that clergymen occupy a central and strategic role as counselors in our society. A recent study of where people go for help with serious problems indicated that 42 percent had gone to clergymen, 28 percent to nonpsychiatric physicians, and only 30 percent to a psychiatrist, psychologist, or a practicing marriage counselor.¹ This fact, when coupled with the evidence of growing drug abuse in the military community as well as society as a whole, is ample reason for the military chaplain to prepare to extend his pastoral offices to people with problems of drug dependency.

The leaders of various religious denominations are urging the training of clergymen to minister in this area of social need, and are undertaking the development of church-sponsored programs for people with drug problems. The US Catholic Conference, Department of Health Affairs, sponsored a Midsummer Colloquium in August 1970 aimed at facing this problem from a religious perspective. They heard reports on church-sponsored programs such as a half-way house for adolescent girls, a drug prevention center, and a methadone center sponsored by the Miami archdiocesan Catholic Service Bureau.² The Department of Minis-

Chaplain Smith is assigned to the Drug Abuse and Alcoholism Control Division, Headquarters United States Continental Army Command, Fort Monroe, Virginia. One of Chaplain Smith's tasks is to coordinate with all chaplains on Drug and Alcohol Treatment and Counseling Teams.

¹ Gerald Gurin, Joseph Weroff, and Shelia Feld, *Americans View Their Mental Health* (New York: Basic Books, 1960) p. 307.

² *The Catholic Light*, August 6, 1970, p. 12.

try of the National Council of Churches sponsored the publication of an exploratory study of the role of pastor to people involved with drug problems. The study underscored the pastor's role as being basically in three areas: *pastoral care* of those who are drug dependent and those who are flirting with dangerous drugs; *education* of youth and adults with respect to the social problems and personal-invitation-to-disaster in drug abuse; *social action programs* aimed at changing those things in society which contribute to the boredom, loneliness, alienation, anxiety and purposelessness which makes "kick giving" and pain killing drugs attractive.³ This interest of the religious denominations, which the chaplain represents in the military service, is an additional reason for special concern and preparation to minister to people involved in the misuse of dangerous drugs.

To the list of the above areas should be added the most commonly accepted and traditional role of the clergyman. This is his function as community builder, society developer, program organizer and congregational leader. In this creative role his main energies are used to provide health-giving associations in which individuals can grow in favor with God and man. While this may seem to be a truism it is evidently not obvious to all clergymen that an emphasis in this area can be a most effective preventive and restorative one in regard to drug addiction. Undoubtedly, expansion of the concept of the congregation to include many more persons than those attending worship is required, but then chaplains have always worked with such a broadened model. What is most essential in dealing with the likely drug user is programming and group formation which appeals to or will most appropriately provide alternatives to drugs. We must believe that "loneliness, alienation, anxiety, and purposelessness" have counters in our religious associations or our reason for being is deficient.

THE NEED FOR THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

The chaplain, by the very nature of his vocation and function in the military community, must place the problem of drug abuse in a theological context. Only when he has done this will he have sound reasons for offering pastoral care, educational programs, and social action programs to the community he is called to serve. By analyzing the problem of drug dependency in terms he has been trained to use, the chaplain will assert his fundamental role as minister, priest, or rabbi. A theological perspective will keep the chaplain from attempting to assume roles that are not within his professional competence such as playing "doc-

³ Howard J. Clinebell, *The Pastor and Drug Dependency* (New York: Council Press, 1968) pp. 2-3.

tor," "psychiatrist," or "therapist." Most important of all, theological analysis can open an approach to the drug problem through which the chaplain can make a distinctive contribution along with the medically and psychologically trained professional staff within the military community.

Theological analysis of drug abuse rests on the belief that every person has inherent value in the sight of God, and anything which damages the full development of individual personality is wrong. Any use of drugs which contributes to blocking the development of individual personhood or is damaging to the relationships that are necessary for human welfare is spiritually destructive of the central purpose of life. From this premise every chaplain should use the insights and methods of theological analysis of his ecclesiastical tradition to think through the basic moral and religious implications of drug abuse in our society.

1. Theological Analysis of Drug Dependency

The following are some specific areas of drug abuse which need to be put into theological perspective before the chaplain attempts to minister to a drug dependent person. These areas are illustrative (not exhaustive) of the questions that the chaplain may have to deal with as he tries to understand and help a person who is misusing dangerous drugs. Many additional questions of religious significance will undoubtedly occur to individual chaplains as they relate the faith and practices of their denominations to this problem.

a. Chronic use of chemical substances tends to blur reality. This is ultimately a denial of the religious affirmation of the basic goodness of creation. Nature and man are "good" because they are the handiwork of the Creator who is the source of all goodness. A false picture of reality enters when it is perceived by any means which distorts this understanding of the nature of man and the world in which he lives. It is a medical fact that excessive use of any chemical substance eventually damages the human body. For instance: alcoholism often results in malnutritional diseases; barbiturate addiction may result in toxic psychosis and liver damage; amphetamine dependency leads to overtaxing the entire organism; nicotine addiction is associated with lung cancer. Add to this the immediate hazards of accidents and violence which result from drug-induced loss of control over day-to-day events and it becomes clear that such a person is not only injuring himself but he is seriously impairing his ability to participate in the goodness of creation.

Theological insight into man's role in the universe rests on the proposition that life is a gift and a trust to be lived under the

rules of love and justice. Love expresses itself in respect for oneself and others; justice becomes the rule that governs human actions. Damaging one's body and blurring one's perception of reality is incompatible with the basic demands of love and justice. The results are false views of both man and the world in which he lives. Instead of using one's body and mind as instruments of perceiving the goodness of man in the universe, one is easily seduced into cynicism and moral nihilism. On the other hand, the drug-free person has a better chance of perceiving and participating in creation.

b. Drugs, when abused, become substitutes for coping with the challenges and problems of everyday life. It is a technique of escape from the full range of human emotional and intellectual experience. Drug dependency reduces the possibility for the individual to experience God's presence in the everyday events of life. Theological insight considers the full development of personality as the will of God for every human being. From the religious point of view, there is no substitute for coping with situations of stress and tension. Coping is the means of strengthening the kind of personality that God wills for every person. The emotions of fear and anxiety and the facts of pain and suffering are important ingredients in human growth. To mask these experiences with drugs denies a very important part of what it means to be human, and it is likely to close off the freely offered resources of God for building character and will power. Habitual use of drugs forms a pattern which avoids struggle with feelings and problems and produces a weak personality. On the other hand, the person who faces fear, anxiety, and hate without a dependent use of chemical crutches can, with God's help, have a better chance of incorporating the redemptive experiences of love, joy, and wholeness into his life.

c. Drug dependency distorts those elements in man which are most distinctively human—rationality, awareness, and ethical sensitivity. In religious thought, these elements are generally described as the "Image of God" in man. The presence of these elements in man is the point of contact between the Divine and the human. When these distinctive human qualities are diminished or distorted, the possibility of a satisfying and continuing understanding of the Divine is also diminished and distorted. The objective of religious teaching and practice is to increase rationality, awareness, and ethical sensitivity by intellectual inquiry, expanded and deeper interpersonal experiences, and socially relevant programs designed to improve the quality of life of the deprived and repressed people of society. These ways of expressing love and justice in the world can be the means of deepening the Divine-human encounter.

Conversely, the drug dependent person uses drugs as a means of avoiding harsh realities in his world and the nagging anxieties within himself. This failure to develop the Divine gifts within himself and strengthen them by an honest struggle with the hard realities of life dehumanizes him. Theologically speaking, this dehumanization through drug abuse effaces the "Image of God" in the individual person.

d. Misuse of drugs tends to hinder or cripple man's basic need for sustaining relationships. This fact raises the most crucial problem for theological analysis because relationships with God and neighbor are at the heart of the religious life. The stark tragedy of drug dependence is that the authenticity of relationships between a drug user and the people around him is lost. He is pushed into synthetic relationships held together by chemical substances. Synthetic relationships cannot sustain the trust, integrity, self-esteem, cooperation, affection, and awareness which are close to the very essence of a life governed by religious values and insights. In point of fact, the drug abuser is likely to foster distrust, dishonesty, self-rejection, and self-centeredness.

2. *Drugs and Religious Experience*

Theological analysis of the use of drugs becomes extremely important for the chaplain in light of the claim that certain drugs produce genuine spiritual experiences. The claims made by the users of LSD and other hallucinogens is a case in point. Under the influence of LSD one individual reported, "The whole story of creation was in that single small leaf."⁴ Forty-two percent of the people in one study said of their drug experience that they "were left with greater awareness of God, of a higher power, or ultimate reality."⁵ Many subjects under LSD reported experiences strikingly similar to those of the mystics and visionaries of past centuries. They felt that they had come face to face with God and were overwhelmed with a sense of eternal beauty and infinite wisdom. "I saw the Eternal Situation throbbing in space," one reported.⁶ The chaplain must go deeper than merely rejecting these experiences as invalid "instant religion" because they are drug induced. The supporters of "chemical religious experience" will quickly point out that changes in body chemistry by fasting and sleep deprivation have always been a part of the mystic's search for unity with God.

How can the chaplain begin to deal with the claims of drug-induced mystical experiences? First, he can turn to the tradi-

⁴ Sidney Cohn, *Drugs and the Young* (New York: Time-Life Books, 1965) p. 98.

⁵ Houston Smith, "Do Drugs Have Religious Import?" *LSD: The Conscience Expanding Drug* (New York: G. D. Putman's Sons, 1966) p. 159.

⁶ Dale White, "Cults of Chemical Comfort," *Christian Advocate*, Feb. 11, 1965, p. 11.

tional rule for judging any mystical experience—what kind of fruit do such experiences bear in the life of the individual? Do they produce love and concern for others? Do they result in heightened awareness of reality (God) and help resolve conflicts within a person? The evidence is inconclusive, but it seems to suggest that most self-prescribed hallucinogenic drug taking does not produce such results. A leading theologian put it in these words, "Drugs appear able to induce religious experience; it is less evident that they can produce religious lives . . . religion is more than religious experiences."⁷

The chaplain, however, must resolve to keep an open mind when discussing the relationship between drugs and spiritual experience. The evidence is not conclusive enough to have final opinions on the subject. For instance, it is possible that some drugs which do not have the dangers of LSD may be found in the future which will help spiritually blocked people achieve a new openness to divine realities in and around them. Openness at this level of thought does not suggest that the chaplain need surrender the fundamental theological insight that any addiction is a form of idolatry when it becomes the ultimate concern of an individual. Only God has legitimate claim to ultimate loyalty.

3. *The Need to Understand the Problem*

The chaplain who is going to deal with drug abusers needs a working knowledge of the drugs which can be misused; why people misuse dangerous drugs; why drug abuse has become an integral part of the youth culture; the degrees of addiction, and the types of abusers. A basic grasp of this kind of knowledge is second only to the chaplain's theological insight and pastoral concern for the drug dependent person.

The chaplain needs to gain an understanding of why drug abuse has become an integral part of contemporary youth culture. This is not an attempt to say that the drug problem is exclusively a youth problem, because drug abuse is to be found in all sections of our society. However, drug abuse is a more dramatic problem among the young, and it is from this age group that the chaplain is most likely to be confronted with a drug dependent person, because the overwhelming majority of the military community is from the youth subculture.

As the chaplain thinks through the reasons that people take drugs, he must recognize that he is dealing with two realities: his own and that of the young people. He must be careful not to judge the person he is trying to help. He must reach *out* to the drug dependent person, not *down* to him. The pressures that

⁷ Houston Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

cause youthful drug taking must be understood. The assistance which the chaplain offers must work within the context of that person's personal needs. The following basic reasons for drug use should be carefully studied to be certain that the programs and counseling techniques of the chaplain are relevant to the young person's way of thinking about drug use.

a. Acceptability of Drugs in American Society

The young adult in our culture has grown up in an era where drugs of all sizes and colors, in tablet, capsule or liquid form, are an acceptable means for curing a variety of ills. Young people have observed their parents taking tranquilizers to relieve the tension they experience on their jobs one day and taking stimulants to keep awake the next day. It is small wonder that they have decided that drugs in general are all right and that no drug could be as dangerous as their parents claim. In short, American society has developed a belief in the basic acceptance of drug use as a way of coping with day-to-day reality. The growth of drug use as a part of the youth culture indicates that they have learned this new American value extremely well. This clearly indicates that programs to assist people with a drug abuse problem must be guided by this basic insight: *Develop in the individual the power to be discriminating in the use of drugs.* There is a vast difference between taking a pain-relieving drug prescribed by a physician and using a self-prescribed drug to escape reality.

b. Boredom

Many young people are bored with what they feel is a staid society without meaningful challenges. One of the roots of this boredom is the growing affluence of our society. The children of the growing middle class in American society frequently feel that they have nothing worthwhile to do in their after school hours, and, in the case of the soldier, his off-duty hours. There is no need for a job, and no sandlot to burn up their energy. All too frequently this leads to involvement with a gang of bored peers who have nothing to do but seek thrills and kicks. Thus, boredom combined with aimless group life and excessive spending can easily lead to drugs as the road to kicks in our bland modern society. It is ironic that the very affluence that the American middle class has worked so hard to achieve is one of the causes of drug abuse. This should alert the chaplain to another basic principle: *Never be surprised when a young soldier from an educated and well-to-do home shows up as a drug dependent person.*

c. Frustration

The opposite side of the coin from boredom ("There's nothing to do.") is frustration ("They won't let me do what I want to do.") This points to a growing attitude of independence among

the youth of the country. This is particularly true of the poor and deprived young people of the inner city. Where the doors of opportunity and the chance for self-improvement are denied them by poor education, unattractive jobs, and institutionalized prejudice, it is small wonder that they turn to drugs to escape their sense of hopelessness. In fact, drug abuse had been a part of the subculture of the urban poor long before the general public became uneasy about the "drug problem." It was only when parents of the middle and upper classes realized that *their* children were "turning on" with drugs that there was a general outcry against drug abuse. Both the frustration of the poor and the boredom of the affluent point to another significant principle in helping the drug dependent person: *Drug abuse can only be understood as a part of a larger social context.*

SUMMARY

The chaplain, as a clergyman in the uniform of his country, is in a unique position to minister to military people with a problem of drug dependency. His singular opportunities for service lie in his roles as pastor and theologian. A significantly large part of the military population, like the civil population, seeks help for their personal problems from their religious leaders. There is no reason to believe that people with drug use/abuse problems will stop coming to chaplains for advice and help in this problem area.

As a theologically trained individual, the chaplain has a perspective on human problems which he must use in his ministry to drug users. Specifically, he should apply the basic religious doctrines about man and the universe to the human problems that are the causes of drug abuse in such a way as to give hope and courage to individuals seeking help with their addictions. He should develop his pastoral role and theological analysis of the drug scene so that he can participate in programs of education, counseling, and rehabilitation along with medically and psychologically trained professionals.

Finally, and perhaps most important, the chaplain's ministry should be based on his willingness to listen to a human being crying for help. This expression of compassion and concern may be the most significant step in helping a person find the will-power to leave the drug scene. It may also be the occasion for someone who has "journeyed in a far country" to experience God's healing presence in his life.

THE CHAPLAIN: PROPHET, JESTER, OR JERK

Chaplain (COL) Thomas A. Harris

"Like the jester, Christ defies custom and scorns crowned heads."¹

How often do you find the title *chaplain* spelled without the second *a* so that it reads *chaplin*? I wonder if this is really an error; perhaps it is a cosmic Freudian slip. Maybe we ought to be more like that partly pathetic, partly triumphant figure which Charlie Chaplin created early in the century—the little tramp who, though victimized by society, somehow always managed to point up the absurdity of the 'ins.' Somehow the figure created by Chaplin often tended to get hold of the right end of the stick—which, by the way, is a comment made about Christ by another jester of our time, namely, George Bernard Shaw.

The title *chaplain* began with Martin of Tours, a fourth century Saint. Legend says that Martin shared his cloak with a beggar, keeping the smallest part for himself. Thus the little "cape" or *capella*. The *capella* became a relic; its custodian became the *capellanus*, and eventually, the chaplain.²

THE CHAPLAIN AS A JERK

One of the main pictures that the mind conjures up of the chaplain through the ages is that he is the property of the prince, the flunky of the Lord, part of the impedimenta of the Army. He has existed to praise the prince and to urge him to pour it on the peasants. He has been quick to find reasons to reinforce the status quo and to add emotional intensification to the position of the powerful. The need to keep things as they are at all costs has seemed to motivate this priestly functionary. He has blessed the actions of the nobles and preserved his warm place by the fire. Pretending to be morally, ethically, and spiritually dedicated, he has worked to reassure the conscience of his employer. One stereotype that the chaplain has attained, therefore, is that of the castrated flunky of the court.

Chaplain Harris is the Staff Chaplain, Office of the Surgeon General, and has taught at the US Army Chaplain School. He has completed the Psychiatric Training Program for pastoral counseling supervisors at Duke University Medical Center and is a member of the American Association of Pastoral Counselors. This article was originally presented in March at the annual convention of the College of Chaplains, American Protestant Hospital Association.

¹ Harvey Cox, *The Feast of Fools* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1969) p. 140.

² Ray Honeywell, *Chaplains of the US Army*, OCCH, DA, 1958, p. 5.

I do not like the title *chaplain*, nor am I at all sure that I wish to continue under such a banner. You may tell me that the above picture is an extreme one, but I know that it persists as one of the popular, recurring reactions to the term *chaplain*. I think we have done much to perpetuate the view by some of our deeds, both conscious and unconscious. The hospital chaplain, for example, often finds himself supporting the myths of the medical profession. Too often he cooperates in maintaining the fantasy of the physician as a flawless magician who, if obeyed, can guarantee health. Another example is the way the chaplain encourages patients to express to him hostile feelings which they hold toward the physician or the nurse, thus subtracting from their need to take any further action through law, outside influence, or confrontation. By so doing, chaplains also make it easier for the physician to continue in his unreal view of himself, and take from him the need to admit and deal with understandable human errors. The chaplain may talk in terms of lowering anxiety levels and may demonstrate in case conference after case conference how well ventilation works and how much his people need a chance to express their negative feelings to one who accepts, but one of the main effects he causes is that of destroying any drive to change the situation. This is regrettable, for the patient's reaction may have been a valid response to a blunder by the physician or to an obstinate refusal by the physician to deal with his patients as human beings.

On the institutional level hospital chaplains tend to assume too often that the "given" is the "right," that the institution works in the best possible manner and must be supported. We chaplains draw our sustenance from the administrative policies of the hospitals and we work there by permission of the physicians who must, therefore, be right. If our tenure has been long and our salaries and status have grown, there is even more reason to accept the divine right of the status quo. We may know that the method of making medical care available (the health service's delivery system) is complex and antiquated, having been superimposed on the basic confusion of the past, but we don't fight it. We may know that the cost of care to the patient has grown astronomically not only because of new, expensive equipment, highly specialized care, and growing labor costs, but also because of lack of planning. Yet we offer no objection. We have our lockers in the clubhouse of the doctors and are afraid we might lose our club rights if we complain.

In correctional institutions, chaplains may be serving as custodians in a school for crime, but their fears of both the inmates and the staff and their identification with the State can blind

them to courses of action that might help change the system to one in which rehabilitation is possible. In addition, prison chaplains may fear what might happen to them if their aggressive drives were allowed to go unchecked. The prison riot may be an enlarged photograph of what they fear might happen to them if the State does not systematically and punitively arrange for the restriction of offenders. In macrocosm in the prison, they may see themselves in terms of their own need for shackles. They therefore jump when they are told and they justify their actions rationally, intellectually, logically—beautifully.

In the military setting the game is also played effectively. Because of my many years in the military, I am more sensitive to that situation. I know that most of us deny our identification with the military system, certainly with the use of military force as a means of handling international differences. We tend to say that we are in the system simply because it exists as an arm of society and the people who do society's dirty work for it must be served. Or we subtly identify with the best of the system and point out that many military people serve only because their culture wants them to, and thus the evil is in the total culture as well as in the military. We may say we minister to the military even as civilian clergy minister to a sinful total society. The only way out is to resign from the human race. This is one of my rationalizations. But is it true? As a human being, I too am an intellectual gymnast. I can fake myself out beautifully. The fact that I draw a large salary and struggle to find ways to make others believe in the basic chivalry of the military is often all too clear to me. And I often serve the system rather effectively, I think. Nonetheless, when I set out to provide ways for people to live in a more human way in the system, I thereby help to perpetuate that system.

I am sure that these charges hold as well for the industrial chaplain, who works within a confused and intricate economy to assist people so that they can be relied upon in the work force. This identifies him with you and me as part of the problem. The chaplain to the tobacco industry in the South must find ways to vindicate his work. We are human and we are self-centered; it is difficult for us to see what we don't want to see. Or worse, if we do see it, we know how to explain or mitigate it for a time.

I know that many of us rise far above the negative, foolish picture I have painted. I agree that many of our defenses are based on truth. But I am sure you and I need no help in our defensiveness. None of that does away with the danger which I am asking us to face. We as "chaplains" can too easily become more like puppets on a string than like people of freedom and

responsibility. When a puppet has its strings pulled it tends to jerk. Do you remember the film *Parable* in which living marionettes were jerked and controlled by the owner of the circus, Magnus the Great, who with his evil fellows later jerked, controlled and killed the clown? You can understand the word *jerk* in the title of this paper in either the slang meaning of an unworthy clod who is less than human or you can picture in your mind the puppet on a string. Both, unfortunately, are elements in the chaplaincy of most of us. We are indeed, all too often, jerks.

What intensifies the situation is that unlike most puppets chaplains are able to figure out ahead of time who is going to pull the strings and in what manner, so that they can make the movements appear to be *natural* and *smooth*. The better trained the chaplain is the easier it is for him to accomplish this feat. In addition, the really effective chaplain knows how to get other people to move when the strings are pulled. At times they even help the puppeteer to tie others on his strings. Whether they do so by churchly ministrations or by subtle or not so subtle, directive or nondirective counseling, is unimportant. Chaplains are jerks and they want others to jerk with them when the strings are pulled. They can even write the script for the string pullers and lay themselves and others out to be attached to the strings. This is called "clinical pastoral education" and, at its worst, it is often most effective.

THE CHAPLAIN AS PROPHET AND PRIEST

By now I hope you are angry. Possibly you are not; you may have simply sloughed off this entire approach as overdone and thus as unworthy of further consideration. If so, you merely confirm my argument. You are a *happy* puppet and *enjoy* being manipulated. Most of us, however, cannot be happy living as puppets. Realizing that we have drifted more and more into the trap, we flail about for a way out. We sincerely prefer to sing with Pinnochio, "I've got no strings to hold me up." So what do many of us do? We react by reaffirming our "religious" function. Don't forget that one of the wrong, but common, functions of "religion" is to attempt to manipulate God—to get Him on our strings. This type of "religious" reaction is really not much better than the reflexive jerk of the marionette.

If we emphasize the "prophetic" approach in our reaction, we are likely to talk very spiritedly about putting tension on an evil culture. We begin, as the prophets did, to "speak for God." The danger in speaking for God is that before long we have God speaking for us. We are like the clergyman I know who does not

preach, "Why can't you be like Jesus, I am," but rather preaches, "Why can't you be like me, Jesus was." It is simple. We decide to discern God's will and serve Him perfectly. We spend time in the seminary and on our own in striving to find God's word for today and in rightly setting forth the doctrine. Well, since God is a pretty decent sort, surely He will show us His will if we do our part. We, therefore, study, work, reflect and meditate, after which everything becomes clear. What has happened is that we have subtly substituted our will for God's will. Our *whims* have become God's *will*. When people differ with us, we respond with great fervor because it is not simply our human argument but, above all, God's will which is being contested. This is the time to bristle. The prophetic stance changes from speaking for God to fighting for Him. Under what we call the guidance of Heaven we become as uncooperative as Hell.

The result of all of this is that we refuse to join any team unless we are allowed to carry the ball all the time. Our institutions—whether medical, industrial, correctional, military, or collegiate will find that they cannot get along with us and thus they may decide not to let us continue to serve from within. Our potential usefulness will be lost.

Another stance of the prophet is that of personal self-righteousness and/or judgmental piety. As perfectionists we can brook no failures on the part of the people we are supposed to serve. We think we are marching with Glasser, Mowrer and others into the arena of freedom and responsibility. We confront our people with their failures in such a way that they can only reject us if they have anything of worth within them. We moralize, using our sophisticated training to justify our actions. We reject, calling it confrontation. We refer to our patronizations as an honest self-congruent recognition of our true values as compared to the clear-cut nonvalues of our people, who do not measure up to our standards. We see them as worthless puppets flopping about awkwardly on their strings. Like Elijah of old we have a victory or two, and then, because the whole world does not go our way, we enjoy the self-pity that is the delectable satisfaction of the righteously lonely. We run from God lest He show us the 7,000 others who see even more clearly than we do the true purposes of God.

As prophets we tend to draw the line between ourselves and our culture; we measure our greatness in terms of our quite natural rejection by our institutions and by our peers. There is no one so lonely as the man who is using loneliness to prove just how righteous he is. Like some of the prophets of old, we oversimplify so beautifully that the clear truths we stand behind ac-

tually become lies. Back, we cry, to the good old days of the desert and away from the fertility rites of the agricultural society—to say nothing of the fleshpots of the city! But there is no way back. The true prophet can only be discerned as the obscuring stones are removed one by one from his dead body. What remains may have been holy, but it was also something less than human.

Another of the “religious” reactions to the danger of puppetry is the way of the priest. Here God is the divine puppet and the strings we have Him on are the strings of doctrine, of sacrament, and of other forms of worship. If we can purify ourselves ritualistically and ceremonially and revise our liturgies in the direction of God’s truth, then we can serve men by “re-presenting” God to them. We can, as the military chaplain cliché states it, “Bring God to man and man to God.” By preparing properly and by repeating the right words and actions in a proper sequence, we can surely force God to be good on our terms. We can also feel better within. So the chaplain withdraws from confronting people or institutions and steps up his activities in dispensing the sacraments and in peddling piety to the simple people of the larger or smaller parish. There is no way out of this trap through simply revising the liturgy and experimenting in new activities in worship. (To me it seems impossible to conceive of “experimental” worship any more than “experimental” sexual relations. One either worships or he doesn’t.) For what we are saying in seeking for new formulae is simply that the old approach was right but the words and actions were wrong. We play the same music but change the steps of the dance.

It is also the priest who is the teacher of doctrine, the purveyor of a rational and historical system of concepts about life, certified by God. This too fails for the chaplain, because the problems we work with seem to have no answers. Or maybe our answers are like that of Sri Ramikrishna in response to the questions of one who wanted to know why, if God was both good and powerful, He could allow evil and suffering. To this Rami-krishna is supposed to have said, “To thicken the plot.”³ Perhaps Albert Schweitzer was closer to our needs when he observed that having answers tends to deaden compassion by just that much. If I know why you suffer, then I am less concerned with your suffering.

This has all been foreshortened but there has been enough said to point up the problem of the chaplain who runs toward “religion,” whether into prophecy or priestliness, to escape from the threat of being forever a puppet on a string. There is much

³ John Cage, *Silence* (Wesleyan Press, 1961) p. 63.

error mixed with the truth, but there is enough truth, I hope, to sting a little.

Where does that leave us? Who could doubt from the title and length of this article that we must now be close to the answer. But the answer of the "jester" is only an answer in the sense that it denies the easier answer of the puppet and the prophet. It is really not an answer; it is a recognition that being human is more important than having answers.

THE CHAPLAIN AS JESTER

Since I began historically with the stereotype of the chaplain as a feeble, foolish functionary, perhaps it is in order to take up the term *jester* from the same approach. The jester was the one man in the court who could stand up to the prince, or the baron, or the man of wealth. Because of this he was the one person who had a chance of doing the humanizing thing. It was his job to stick pins into pretentious people, to point up the errors of his master, to expose callous policies as evil. It was his job to be the representative of the rest of us in the court of the king. If the peasant had a chance to get the aristocrat off his back, it was because the "fool" showed the ruler how foolish his wisdom really was. The jester was the humanizer, the enabler, and, yes, even the "en-nobler." True, he had to take great care how he went about it. He had to hide the thrust of his statement in a joke or a jest or a silly song, but that was the mark of his worth as a jester. He had to find the way to get the king to let up. If he failed, the people had little recourse. He had to learn the truth of the ancient saying that "he who brings bad tidings to the king should have one foot in the stirrup." The scriptural injunction most to the point for the jester is that which points up the need to be as wise as serpents and harmless as doves (Matthew 10:16).

The pitfalls and pratfalls of the jester were the risks of his trade. They were the recognized occupational hazards. It was indeed a difficult role and I suppose many failed, and their heads—cap and bells and all—rolled into an obscure corner of the banquet hall; nevertheless, let us hope, many succeeded.

There is a bit of the prophet in the jester as well. Remember the story of the prophet Nathan who branded David with "Thou Art the Man," after telling a seemingly nonthreatening story about an injustice done to a poor farmer by a wealthy man? With David the story had an effect. Today one wonders if Nathan would have been so successful. It appears that the kings of old (at least some of them) had brains enough to keep their jesters to make sure their royal feet would be held to the fire of humanity. How easy it is to believe in our importance if no one gives us

feedback! How many times have we run our chaplain programs somewhere off by ourselves with a little circle of sanctimonious followers cloaking our idiocy from others, and thus from ourselves? It is not easy to have the import of our actions held up before us, because sooner or later we are going to be shown to be wrong. Such an exposure is unsettling because we either have to revise our own self-image downward or we have to do something about it. (It should also be said that there is something of the priest in the jester as well. He does, in fact, represent us before God.)

In our present culture it is less and less possible to find a true court jester. If he is a true jester he is *persona non grata* at court. It is only when we are honestly trying to improve that we can stand having our policies held up to ridicule. There must be strength if we are to permit irony or sarcasm to exist. Humor cuts through inadequacies in such a way that they cannot be hidden. Today we have many wisecrackers but few, if any, humorists. Where is the Will Rogers of our day? The warm, salty humor of Rogers came from pointing up the human inadequacies of a Congress and a nation neither of which had overly inflated views of their self-importance. (The wisecracks of a Bob Hope are quite another thing—they are the harmless pebbles thrown by a small boy rather than the well-aimed, but deadly stones hurled by a David.) Today the climate is not favorable for jesters either in court or out of court. The foolish and destructive actions of the young rebels in our society leave no room for humor. No one is as puffed up and vain as many of the young, self-styled, generation-gap revolutionaries of our day.

Maybe it is not all that dark. I do not want to fall into the error of the prophet, but I think there is some truth in my argument.

Let's get out of the halls of State and over into our own bailiwicks. In our hospital institutions, perhaps, there is still room for a viewpoint that shows the human limitations of people, whether they are administrators, doctors, chaplains, or patients. There is still room for someone who can stick a pin in the puffed-up self-importance of those who find some pleasure in their own misfortunes or have no concern for the very real problems of others. There is room for one who is foolish enough to believe that there are invisible matters that are more important than the visible in the midst of a "just-the-facts" culture. There is need for a clown who knows that stilted dignity is not a very viable posture for a human being—however educated, however wealthy, however pious he might be. There is a need for one who can bring a wry smile by pointing up the limitations of our knowl-

edge, or by referring quietly to the physically obvious fact of the inevitability of death for us all. There is a need for one who knows that all human techniques must fail because man is more complex than the most complex of them. There is need for one who knows that to be a doctor or a lawyer or a chaplain or a man of wealth or power is really nothing at all compared to the fact that all of us put our trousers on one leg at a time. (These days of feminine lib, combined with the styles of today, make that comment rather inclusive.)

It is the jester who has a chance of correcting us all when our stated values and our actual behavior are so widely divergent as to be ludicrous. It is a true, important, and most needed fool who can know in the midst of his jesting that he also can be wrong. And yet it is the jester who is the true believer. If he did not believe that man could overcome hypocrisy, why would he even recognize it? If he did not know that God cares, how could he be so sensitive to the callous actions of people? If he did not believe that compassion was still possible, why would he be able to portray his own pathetic stance so vividly as to cause us to identify with him? If he did not believe in life eternal, how could he jest even in the teeth of his own death?

Robert MacAfee Brown in a recent article in the *Christian Century* comments on Christ as a clown figure.⁴ He directs our attention to Emmett Kelly, the circus clown who so painstakingly attempted to sweep up a spot of light from the floor of the arena. We knew he couldn't do it, but we knew that what he was doing was a true picture of much of our lives. Just recently I watched a portion of the ancient Chaplin film, *The Gold Rush*. In it the little tramp, starving in a dilapidated cabin out in the wilderness, cooked for himself and a guest a Thanksgiving dinner made up of nothing but his own worn out old shoe. He cooked up the shoe and served it with a flair, as if it were the finest of turkeys or tenderest of steaks. He believed so strongly in what he was doing that his guest joined him in the feast. With a flourish the little tramp lifted up the shoelaces and twined them spaghetti-like around his fork and swallowed them with a smile of satisfaction. He even burped when he finished. He was hypnotized, perhaps, by his own fantasy—or given over completely to the art of living with the facts of life. When we have nothing else, perhaps it really isn't so foolish to learn how to be satisfied with very little. To know we are going to die is not so bad if we savor the life we now have and enjoy it to the end, only to find out then that it was no more than a shoe for a

⁴ "From Clown to Fish," Feb. 23, 1972, p. 222.

banquet, or rather, that although the feast featured in materialistic terms only a shoe, the feast was nonetheless a feast.

Maybe you are content to go on being a prophet, or a priest, or a "jerk." I hope for more, myself. Perhaps I am still trying to sweep up that spot of light or make a feast out of an old shoe, but I refuse to race into the realm of the prophet and the priest, and I certainly want to break out of the puppet show, even if the freedom I find is only the freedom to go on being foolish. (Paul had some words to say about that.) If to be serious means to accept the structure of things as they are, (the hospital, the penitentiary, the Army, the Congress, our total society) then I prefer to be silly. I cannot hide either in the culture or in the *cultus*. I must be who I am, even if I realize how foolish and how futile that statement is as I make it.

It intrigues me to note with Robert MacAfee Brown the likeness between the Rouault clown-face and the Rouault Christ-face. It encourages me when I am told that through the centuries one of the symbols of Christ has been that of God's fool. Christ, the cosmic, rather than comic, clown whose life ended in victory over death, was the one man who really had a grip on reality. His reality was so different from that which this world accepts as reality that it is often seen as ludicrous. Philosophers continue to rediscover the foolishness of the faith.

Lest you stick a pin in my balloon, I hasten to do it myself by pointing out that I know I am a fool when I proclaim my goal to be similar to the goal of Jesus. If it is, I am in good company; if it is not, then that is my fault and not His. Perhaps I'll fall on my "prat." But if I do, he'll not only laugh with me, he'll lift me up. Help me find a title less offensive than that of *jester* that yet includes the best of that term and I'll thank you for it. Personally I had rather be a jester than a jerk, or a prophet, or a priest . . . or a chaplain. How about you? I close with these words from Harvey Cox in his book, *The Feast of Fools*:⁵

Only by learning to laugh at the hopelessness around us can we touch the hem of hope. Christ the clown signifies our playful appreciation of the past and our comic refusal to accept the spectre of inevitability in the future. He is the incarnation of festivity and fantasy.

All I can say is, "On with the dance."

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 142.

AN ARMY "INDUSTRIAL" CHAPLAINCY MODEL

Chaplain (MAJ) Clinton E. Grenz

The role of an Army chaplain is well known in military circles. A new dimension, however, known as the Army "Industrial" Chaplaincy, has been added at the Sacramento Army Depot. This prototype model represents a vital new dimension for labor as well as for managerial supervisors within the Army Materiel Command. The rationale for this concept is based on a number of observations: (1) the ever-increasing shift in emphasis from strictly economic values to moral and spiritual values,¹ (2) the availability to the command of supportive services dedicated to the enrichment of the spiritual life of every person working in the military-industrial complex, and (3) managerial behavioral science research findings which indicate the need to develop non-economic motives to reduce conflict and ambiguity in inter-personal relations and personality variables between management and employees.²

The Army Materiel Command is primarily an industrial environment in which the *civilian* work force constitutes the majority of the "troops" and in which the assigned military minority operates within industrial management life patterns. Two Army Regulations, AR 165-20 and AR 37-100, provide for the religious and moral needs of authorized civilians, as well as military personnel and their families. The Depot Commanding Officer has encouraged this model program, therefore, to meet the needs of the entire work force.

INDUSTRIAL CHAPLAINCY DEVELOPMENT

An emphasis on ministering to the problems and needs of workers has occurred in various places. During the Russian Revolution defrocked priests worked in factories and ministered as industrial chaplains. For many years England had a type of Industrial Chaplaincy which was concerned with the human needs of workers.³ In the United States the industrial concept as we know it today was pioneered over twenty years ago. At present

Chaplain Grenz is the Staff Chaplain at the Sacramento Army Depot, Sacramento, California. In addition to his college and seminary degrees, he has a Master of Science degree in Education from Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas.

¹ Lowell F. Soderman, *Business and Industrial Chaplaincy*, March 1969, p. 3.

² Rensis Likert, *New Patterns of Management*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1961).

³ David Morris, "The Industrial Chaplain—Total Involvement," (McAdenville, N.C.: Pharr Yarns Inc., 1971) p. 1.

an estimated 125 companies have Industrial Chaplaincy programs.⁴

ARMY "INDUSTRIAL" MODEL

The commander and management have a number of functional areas of responsibility for the entire authorized work force. For example, the Army medical officer provides a wide range of preventive care, emergency care and occupational health services to civilian employees; the 1970 Occupational Safety and Health Act, as well as Army Regulations, form the legal basis for this work. In addition, the Chief Counsel, a civilian who acts in the position of a Military Judge Advocate, renders legal assistance to both civilian and military personnel in the work force in such areas as counseling management officials in labor-management problems, providing legal advice to many active duty and retired military personnel, and assisting civilians who are employed by the military. Many civilians are referred by the writer to the Chief Counsel when their problems have legal implications. Furthermore, the chaplain, as the staff officer responsible for advising the commander on the moral, morale, and religious needs of the command, works directly with civilians.

Perhaps chaplains have isolated themselves too long, limiting their ministry only to the soldier, forgetting that the soldier does not operate in a vacuum by himself but rubs shoulders with many authorized civilian counterparts. As a member of the staff, the chaplain must be involved in the well-being of the entire population that serves each installation. If he is to serve the soldier effectively, he must also serve the civilian with whom the soldier works.

Commanders and managers are discovering that they cannot be effective without good human relations. The Army "Industrial" chaplain can assist commanders, managers and the work force by providing various supportive ministries which focus on the individual, his problems, and needs.

THE COUNSELING MINISTRY

Managers at every level attempt to identify problems, recognize patterns, and set goals through various techniques and styles. Very often the individual's personal problem is not met satisfactorily after it has been identified. The chaplain, through his counseling ministry, becomes a valuable asset to management due to his training and experience. He becomes an interpreter and communicator of human and spiritual needs, as well

⁴ *The San Diego Union*, June 26, 1970, Sec B, p. 2.

as a projector of human and spiritual hopes.⁵ He becomes a part of the problem-solving team in his concern for the individual.

The Army Materiel Command chaplain faces the kinds of problems which other chaplains and ministers face: religious and moral conflicts, alcoholism and drug abuse, family financial problems, supervisor and worker conflicts, and marital frictions. FM 16-5 states: "The chaplain is available to individuals under military jurisdiction, who desire confidential interviews." Within the Army Materiel Command this includes civilian and military personnel alike.

PREVENTIVE MINISTRY

Management is recognizing that its employees are its most valuable assets, and therefore wants to help them.⁶ The Army "Industrial" chaplain is equipped to offer supportive educational services to first line supervisors, middle managers and executives to improve human relations as it relates directly to counseling skills, communications, and alcohol and drug rehabilitation. The major emphasis is to have a *balanced managerial concern for human relations and productivity*.

This type of ministry will result in improved understanding, attitudes, and behavioral patterns among the supervisory force. Critiques from supervisors have indicated an unusually high degree of acceptance of this supportive service.

REDEMPTIVE MINISTRY

The Army "Industrial" Chaplaincy does not attempt to provide for the *total* religious needs of the civilian workforce. It functions as a *supplement* to the local ministries of local churches. It emphasizes breakfast study groups, noon luncheons, and evening "rap" sessions, as well as weekly religious informal happenings conducted during employee luncheon breaks.

The rapport and communicative relationship that has been established at the Sacramento Army Depot through these informal study groups has created a better understanding both horizontally between man and man and vertically between God and man. Civilian clergymen are delighted that this kind of ministry is provided by the command through an Army chaplain.

COMMUNITY INTERRELATIONS MINISTRY

This experimental program helps bridge the gap between the

⁵ Soderman, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

⁶ The *World Journal Tribune* (New York) January 9, 1967, p. 27.

community and the military-industrial complex. The Army chaplain is the command's religious liaison representative to community religious groups. The Army provides a resource person for community churches, organizations, and counseling centers. This writer has served as guest minister for churches, presented briefings at ministerial meetings, schools, and civic organizations, served as group facilitator at youth meetings, "rap" sessions, and weekend retreats, and as guest instructor for church leaders in church management, counseling, and religious education.

In conclusion, command and management have a moral, ethical, and social responsibility to society. Leaders are beginning to realize their obligations and are doing something about them. Guilford Dudley, Jr., President of the Life and Casualty Insurance Company of Tennessee, puts it this way, "The business man of the future must develop finer judgments because the problems of the world present themselves more and more in moral terms." Although one problem facing our world today is the underdeveloped nation, the underdeveloped man is a greater danger.⁷ Military chaplains who are part of the Army "Industrial" team can more fully demonstrate their concern for human beings because of the renewed interest of industry, command, and management in emphasizing human and spiritual values within a working community environment.

⁷ Soderman, *op. cit.*, p. 18.

RELIGION AND THE MODES OF BECOMING

Charles R. Stinnette, Jr., Ph.D.

I. RELIGIOUS AND PSYCHIATRIC FACTORS IN BECOMING

Erik Erikson, in his masterful survey of man's being and becoming in this culture, comes near the end of his work to a description of one characteristic of modern man—his heritage of rootless moralism—which is strikingly similar to George Santayana's picture in *The Last Puritan*. The eventual result of puritanism at its worst, he writes, “. . . was that men were born who failed to learn from their mothers to love the goodness of sensuality before they learned to hate its sinful uses. Instead of hating sin, they learned to mistrust life. Many became puritans without faith or zeal.”¹ Surely this is a familiar phenomenon, where a distorted religion which has reversed the relation of faith and works has prevented man from entering fully into the inheritance which is his under God. Perhaps this distorted form of religion is one strong reason which has moved modern man to view his own being and becoming entirely apart from the religious dimension. But as we know, “reaction formations” always bring their own unhealthy result. In rejecting moralism, modern man has espoused utilitarianism. He has exchanged the demon of “oughtness” for the tyranny of manipulation and “usefulness”—and the shadow of “Big Brother” hovers in the wings where a forbidding God used to loiter.

If we are to accept two basic concepts which are crucial for an understanding of man, namely, his *psychosomatic wholeness* and the *dynamic quality of his being and becoming*, we cannot afford to ignore the fact that somatic processes are related not only by impersonal causality but also in terms of meaning, spiritual commitment, and relationship to wholes. Man is not only the *recipient* of acts; he is also the *source* of acts. And his actions must be understood in terms of *aims* as well as *causes*. Our

Dr. Stinnette is currently helping to organize a Doctor of Ministry degree program at Phillips University, Enid, Oklahoma. He previously taught at Union Theological Seminary in New York (1956-1962) and at the University of Chicago Divinity School (1962-1971). He is the author of *Anxiety and Faith, Faith, Freedom and Selfhood*, and *Learning and Theological Perspective*. This article was written several years ago when he was assigned as a MOBDES Reserve Chaplain in the Office of the Chief of Chaplains.

¹ Read all of Chapter 8, *Childhood and Society*, (New York: Norton, 1955) where Erikson develops the idea that the first and most important crisis of life is the development of *trust*. Chaplains should be able to apply much of this in their teaching and pastoral ministries. See also Gordon W. Allport, *Pattern and Growth in Personality* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963) Chapter 4.

methodological skills by which we focus on one area of man's becoming must not be used to diminish either the greatness or the mystery of man, thereby slaying the living creature. Two lines from e. e. cummings are relevant here.

. . . given the scalpel they dissect a kiss; or, sold the reason they undream a dream.

In order to be himself, man needs both analysis and transcending aims. He needs the passion of a purpose which is as concrete as daily bread and as stable and tenacious as that love which "bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things," (I Corinthians 13:7). There are many social scientists today (Abraham H. Maslow² and Gordon Allport among them) who are insisting that their *ad hoc* findings about man's becoming be related to the larger aims and values of humanity. They should not be in the position, as George Santayana once put it, of "redoubling their effort when they have forgotten their aim."

A PRAGMATIC VIEW

We are concerned with the religious and psychiatric factors in becoming. I propose that we look at these factors and the process of becoming in a purely pragmatic way. If we take man as we find him, we discover that his life consists of developments which can be analyzed in psychic, social, and biological terms; but man's life can also be viewed in the light of his devotion to recreating wholes which yield meaning, purpose, and direction. Some of the polarities of his becoming are the movement from the organism to the person, from dependency to autonomy, from authority without to authority authenticated within, but in each case while the process consists in part of natural growth, it also involves his action as a person in response to reality. "To be human," writes Berdyaev, "is to be endowed with freedom and summoned to creativity."

A pragmatic view of man's religion begins with the assumption that it serves the function of aiding man in his relation to and understanding of the ultimate reality to which he responds. Man's life consists of adjustments to the claims of reality, cultural patterns which define his relation to others, and religious practices which enable him to endure while relating to these claims. Paul Tillich holds that the substance of culture is religion, and the form of religion is culture. Such a view takes religion as an exclusive possession away from ecclesiastical organizations and

² *Motivation and Personality* (New York: Harper & Row, 1970).

points to its presence as a universal dimension in human life. I prefer to use the word *religion* in this sense, i.e., man's concern with the ultimate.

When we turn to a comparison of the psychiatric to the religious dimension in becoming, we must keep in mind that both are concerned with the same phenomenon but from different perspectives. Both are interested in the helping or caring function, but whereas psychiatry is concerned with getting the person beyond his difficulty without raising ultimate questions, the aim of religion is to open the person to ultimate truth in every crisis of his life. To put it in the extreme, one is engaged in preventing pain and death and the other sees both pain and death as occasions of a transcendent affirmation. "Whether we live," wrote Saint Paul, "we are the Lord's. Whether we die, we are the Lord's. Whether we live, therefore, or die, we are the Lord's," (Romans 14:8).

The family is the place and early childhood is the time when the foundation and structure of personality are laid down. Since the family is the normal instrument in shaping the person, and the culture more or less dictates how this process is to be accomplished, we may regard every neurosis as in some sense a judgment upon our methods of child rearing. But methods here must include attitudes as well as techniques. From the beginning, apparently, quality as well as quantity counts in the healthy nurture of children. Indeed, the deeper attitudes of the parents are so important that Erikson is moved to write that "healthy children will not fear life if their parents have integrity enough not to fear death."

GENUINE AUTONOMY

Surely we would all agree that genuine autonomy is the goal and expected outcome of the progressive stages in becoming a person. But when we use the word *autonomy*, we intend to emphasize the agency of the self in touch with the rest of reality, rather than some kind of absolute independence. *Autonomy* cannot be used to mean that the individual is a law unto himself, arbitrarily generating himself in isolation. Its derivatives, *autos* and *nomos*, self-law, emphasize the capacity of the person for self-direction in relation to the universal law. Autonomous man is not the so-called "self-made man," but man who has incorporated the reasonableness or lawfulness of justice and truth at the heart of reality. He is dominated neither by impulse from within nor by alien claims from without. Freedom is the mode of his response to reality.

In the light of this understanding of autonomy, it is significant

that all of the modes of becoming reveal a movement from a specific and contingent fulfillment to a more autonomous and free-ranging response. This is obvious in the case of growth. The human species, unlike the rest of the animal world, requires a long period of nurture before he is ready for a relatively autonomous existence. His helplessness and dependency at birth, greater than most animals, is in sharp contrast to the free-ranging self-transcendence which he enjoys at maturity, enabling him, again in contrast to most animals, "to slip the surly bonds of earth."

Hence man must become human. He is not born with a fully developed capacity for human existence. He is a being and a becoming whose history is a dynamic interaction of heredity and environment marked by a number of simultaneous modes or directions in development. I propose to call a few of these modes of becoming to your attention.

MODES OF BECOMING

(1) First there is *maturation*. It is the genius of Freud to have related the biological development of the child to its psychic component in his theory of psycho-sexual development. Erikson has built upon Freud's foundation and extended this integrated view of psychobiology to the resulting social attitudes which result from the developing crisis of the person's becoming in what he calls "the eight stages of man's life." They are: (a) the oral-receptive resulting in either *trust* or *mistrust*, (b) the anal retentive resulting in either *autonomy* or *shame*, (c) the genital relating issuing in either *initiative* or *guilt*, (d) latency when *industry* and *inferiority* are alternatives, (e) adolescence where *identity* and *role confusion* are paramount, (f) young adulthood characterized by *intimacy* or *isolation*, (g) adulthood, *generativity* versus *stagnation*, and (h) maturity marked by *integrity* or *despair*.

A central motif in this view of man's becoming is the thrust toward *identity*. It seems significant to me that the foundation of the child's positive identity is grounded in the capacities for receiving, giving, and relating, which correspond to the oral, anal, and genital stages. Hence the fact that the capacity to receive love precedes the capacity to give, and to relate by means of love is strikingly paralleled by the Hebrew-Christian emphasis upon prevenient grace, the gospel as gift, and the central affirmation that we love because God first loved us. The infant who has lived by the biological and human necessity of receptivity in a state of helplessness becomes the child (and later the adult) who by his own consent *gives* and *relates* by means of his

own somatic processes. Here, surely, it is clear that man is a psychophysical totality. Nothing can be experienced on the physical level without at the same time being deeply spiritual. From the psychiatric or religious perspective, the strength of identity in the adult is largely a measure of the adequacy with which these attitudes of receiving, giving, and relating have been incorporated.

(2) Again consider the modes of *learning*. Psychologists tell us that the simplest form of learning is conditioned reflex—Pavlov's dogs salivating at the sound of a bell which they had come to associate with feeding. Next in the scale of learning come imitation and skill learning which in most cases must await the development of motor control. Closely associated is the knowledge that comes by reading and absorbing. The fullest development in learning capacity comes with the capacity for problem solving (experimental learning in the sense of trial and error) and the development of insight. The educational psychologists remind us that in all these stages of learning the principle of functional subordination is operative. Having learned the motor skills and the relevant cues, some people can also be solving problems as they drive to and from work.

Now there is a further dimension in this process of learning which gathers up all of its modes in the acting person. Immanuel Kant spoke of the primacy of practical reason, by which he meant to indicate that man reflecting upon his modes of learning is not the same as man utilizing all of these modes—as he cares for, guides, and disciplines his children, for instance. The child care worker has discovered the value of this actional mode in the child's play. Indeed, some hold that the "child's play is the infantile form of the ability to deal with experience by creating model situations and to master reality by experiment and planning."³ But here again we are already in the area of religion with its actional ways of dealing with and responding to ultimate reality. The child's play is not only the precursor of the models by which the adult brings reality under his control, but it is also a form of worship by which the child acts out the ultimate meaning of his life. As Saint-Exupery has said, "We live not on things but on the meaning of things."

(3) *Language* represents another mode of becoming. George Herbert Mead held that language is primarily oral gesture—that the essence of communication is gesture and role taking. Anyone who has seen a performance by the inimitable Marcel Marceau will surely be struck by the relevance of this claim. In the space

³ Erikson, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

of two minutes, without a spoken word, he tells the story of life by acting out childhood, youth, maturity, and old age.

Jean Piaget, Charles Odier, and others have brought to our own attention the fact that language and words are first embedded in action, and that the child's use of words amounts to a primitive and logical realism. First definitions tend to be in verb form—"Arms are to hug," etc.—and the perfectly logical mind of the child may conclude quite calmly that the opposite of "O.K." is "No K."

This association with the concrete in the child's language must give place to a capacity for abstraction and the processes of rational thought as education progresses. Yet I wonder if it does not represent a continuing mode by which meaning, flavor, and zest for living are reintroduced into existence beyond our lifeless extractions. The great dancer Pavlova was once asked to explain the meaning of a dance she had just performed. "Do you think I would dance it if I could explain it?" she replied. Music, drama, myth, and symbol enable one to endure by relating him to the wholes of life again. They gather up the fragments of existence in a melody, an antiphon, or a deep surging folk song.

(4) *Identity and language* are joined in the emerging self. Again George Herbert Mead⁴ held that one learns his identity by experimentally taking the roles of others and by adding his own individual stamp. Like the prodigal son, one must come to himself. It may come as a shock to some to learn that not all consciousness is self-consciousness. The infant does not make a distinction between himself and his mother. The discovery of that vast world which is "not me" brings with it the soul-shaking news that I am not an "it" but a separate and distinct "I" who now must live with all the hazards of self-consciousness. Perhaps one of the first signs of the self that is to be is the new-found power of the word "No!" Allport talks of a two-year-old who visited his grandmother each day for the sole purpose of announcing, "Grandma, I won't!"⁵

The quest for identity is the major anchorage in man's becoming. The point which I wish to emphasize is that it requires a concrete reference (roots, the "you" is prior to the "I") in an ongoing community and a transcendent meaning. From the religious perspective man's identity is always an incorporation of what has gone before as seen *now* in the light of the promises by which he lives. For the Hebrew-Christian that identity is grounded in God who set his love upon man from the beginning and is faithful in that love to the end of history.

⁴ *Mind, Self, and Society*, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1934).

⁵ *Op. cit.*, pp. 118-119.

(5) *Perception* as a mode of becoming is closely associated with language and identity. The means by which perceptions are sifted and referred to definite concepts with meaningful labels has led to many theories of knowledge. We cannot trace that development here. What we do wish to say is that man is the kind of animate being who is constantly taking his perceptions and organizing them into systematic concepts as a part of his effort to master and control reality. His progress in this respect is reflected in language development, i.e., from the concept limited to a concrete model to abstractions which in some cases can be reduced to a mathematical formula. This is one of the signs of man's greatness. It is also a hazard. Reality is always greater than the formulae which empirical methodology or abstract formulation may yield. Fortunately, man instinctively mistrusts every system, whether theological or scientific. Somehow man knows himself to be more than any effort to explain him in terms of what he has been. "People, it seems," writes Gordon Allport, "are busy leading their lives into the future, whereas the psychologist, for the most part, is busy tracing them into the past."

LITURGY

I would like to conclude this brief survey of the modes of becoming by suggesting an additional one which the textbooks on psychology do not list. It is *liturgy*. Now I know that this word calls to mind "churchy" things to most of you—vestments and ceremonies which perhaps seem almost meaningless. This is unfortunate because originally the word meant the public manifestation of a common life. In the Roman world, liturgy included the work of what we would now refer to as the department of sanitation. Every community from the smallest family to the state has its own liturgy by which the individual is constantly identifying and renewing himself in actions. Gordon Allport speaks of the individual's "style of life" and the anthropologists describe "rites of passage" which mark significant stages in the person's becoming. What I have in mind is similar to but more intimate and more universal than these. You will remember that in our discussion of the modes of learning we emphasized the actional mode as one which gathers up all other dimensions in the acting person—and that we emphasized play as the precursor of this mode. Liturgy, as seen in this perspective which is larger than church rituals, is the public manifestation of the primary values of a community. It is the actional means whereby every individual empathetically participates in the whole, whether of Reno,

the lower East side, New York, or a community of brothers in perpetual prayer.

A number of people have noted that people's lives disintegrate when they lose sight of the meaning and deep common roots of worship and work and play. I am suggesting that liturgy is a deeply rooted activity which affords this recovery. I shall always remember that as a chaplain aboard ship en route to Okinawa in 1945 I was privileged to participate in the Jewish Passover Seder in which Israel's deliverance from the slavery of Egypt is celebrated each year, not only in words but also in action.

Man is educated absolutely, as Kierkegaard would say, at the outer limits of his power—in moral failure, in the threat of meaninglessness and death. He must find some way of gathering up the meaning of his existence in adoration beyond these threats. His ultimate identity requires both a means of participating in that which he intends to become and a community of faith which sustains and communicates that which he most deeply is. The great danger of our common liturgies by which we identify ourselves is that they are constantly becoming the captives of private interest and of magic control. They are corrected and revitalized by the ever-renewing prophetic work of him who assesses their value in relation to the whole of reality—whether the assessor be a psychiatric or a religious worker. The psychiatric helper is more than a tool—more than all the paraphernalia surrounding him. He is a person who encounters other persons en route to becoming themselves. As a person he, too, is concerned for and passionately involved in discovering the wholes of life—wholes which always involve the perspectives of freedom, self-integrity, and ultimate meaning.

II. COMMUNICATION AND COMMUNION IN SOME EARLY MODES OF BECOMING

"We live," wrote Saint-Exupery, "not on things, but on the meaning of things." And the meaning of things, we might wish to add, is inextricably bound to the range and depth of communion which those things provide. The artist by his mastery and touch opens the commonplace for infinite magnitude, while the pedant slams the door to vistas beyond with a few stultifying platitudes. Communication which is not at the same time communion fails at the point where it is distinguishable as a discrete human activity. Communication is an openness to our depths when it is a living two-way exchange between the individual and the springs of his being and becoming. Apart from such renewing nourishment, man suffers alone and separate—and every

other voice is either an insignificant rattling on the roof or the sound of alien claims which can never be met.

In using the word *communication* I suggest that we keep in mind the distinctions between verbal and nonverbal and between conscious and unconscious communication. These distinctions become significant when we bear in mind that whereas the adult employs all four modes much of the time, the very young child is restricted to nonverbal and, in large part, to unconscious communication.

The relation of consciousness to self-consciousness has plagued psychology since the days of William James. The two states are not necessarily identical. Even so, the complexities of their relation are immediately evident to any adult caught momentarily in the embarrassment of "selective inattention." We say that our mind had been "wandering"! When it comes to the nature and origin of the subject which perceives itself in consciousness the intricacies are multiplied. In the earlier Freudian view, the ego was regarded as a "precipitate" which resulted from the interaction between the id and the superego. It emerges sometime after the second year as a referee in the struggle between these opposing forces. While retaining this phenomenological character of the ego, later psychoanalysis has been forced to take into account the fact that some kind of growing center of awareness is present in the infant from soon after birth. There is a tendency now to see this predecessor to the ego as a more or less centered functioning of an innate biological tendency which emerges in the process of organization, regulation, and adaptation to the environment. The relation between consciousness and self-consciousness in this development is still an open question in child development.

In his famous observations concerning the smiling response in infants, Rene Spitz⁶ noted that a new kind of visual communication between mother and child develops between the tenth and twelfth week. At this time the child acquires the capacity to recognize and to respond to the human face. The interesting point here is that the child responds indiscriminately to strangers as well as to mother. But toward the end of the seventh month the infant "recognizes" the difference between his mother and an outsider. Does not this phenomenon represent progress toward the centering of action in an ego which is conscious of itself?

In a recent article on "Sleep, Time and the Early Ego," Sanford Gifford⁷ has studied the process by which the infant tends to

⁶ "Relevancy of Direct Infant Observation," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* (New York: International Universities Press) V, pp. 66-73.

⁷ "Sleep, Time and the Early Ego," *Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association*, January, 1960, VIII, No. 1 pp. 5-42.

adapt to the sleep and wakefulness pattern corresponding to the night and day habits of adults. The author holds that this adaptation stems from the mother's responsiveness "communicated by her periodic absences or variations . . . which in turn are influenced by her own adaptation to the 24-hour cycle of everyday life." The significant point in this study is its evidence of an earlier emergence of the primitive ego than that reflected by the smiling response.

If we ask the question, "How soon is communication possible between mother and child?" we are forced to conclude that this primal ego, like its counterpart in later life, is curiously related to the undergirding communion provided from beyond the ego. In his book *No and Yes On The Genesis Of Human Communication*,⁸ Rene Spitz builds upon Freud's view that the original helplessness of the child is both the prototype of all anxiety and the spur which drives man toward ameliorative actions. Spitz points out that although the cry of the infant in the state of helplessness is only a discharge phenomenon, it is interpreted by the mother as an appeal for help which she appropriately supplies. Here, it would seem, we encounter the primary mode for communication at all levels of human experience. Wherever one human being would reach another isolated by distance, guilt, or incapacity, the preliminary act of empathic identification is necessary. Someone—a mother or a helper or a priest or a friend—must take the first step of bridging the abyss of separation and of understanding a distress signal as a cry for help. The words of Irenaeus suggest an analogy with the work of Christ at this point: "He (i.e., Christ) became as we are in order to make us as He is."

The primary mode of communication seems also to suggest that some kind of centered response is present in the infant from the beginning. Certainly it is something less than conscious ego functioning, but it is, to use Plato's words, a locus of becoming. So far we have avoided the use of the word *self*. The term *ego* is preferred by the psychoanalysts; and even when they do employ the word *self*, as in the case of Harry Stack Sullivan ("self-dynamism") it refers to a process rather than a self-conscious integrity. But as we have seen, a degree of agency (if only for response) is present in the human organism from soon after birth. It is nurtured by empathic and nonverbal communication with the mother. Within that love it is capable of adaptation to human expectation and, by the twelfth week,⁹ to postpone satisfactions in the confidence established by the mother. The twelfth

⁸ New York: International Universities Press, 1966.

⁹ According to Spitz.

week, according to Willie Hoffer,¹⁰ also marks the period when the hand and mouth are brought into purposeful relation to each other. This voluntary act on the part of the infant to gratify his own instinctual needs is described by Hoffer as "the first achievement of the primitive ego" and a means of establishing "the primitive sense of self."

Most child psychologists would agree that both self-consciousness and a measure of self-identity are possible after the second year. This social self coincides with the acquisition of language skills and the maturation of physical and perceptual facilities. In the light of the ego processes which are in evidence before the second year, however, it does not follow that a locus of identity has been absent from birth. Perhaps we need to think of this receptacle of human becomings as both an integer at every level and as a participant in the greater wholes toward which it tends. We have here, it would seem, the other side of the communication model. In responding to the empathic action of another, the primitive ego achieves a unity which anticipates the larger wholes which it is to become. These two sides of the communication model, i.e., the initiating empathic establishment of undergirding communion and the gathered integrity of the self (a literal creation out of nothing) in the act of responding, sound strangely like echoes of *creation* and *redemption* to our ears.

Communication always requires a mode of participation. One might say that it needs a conductor. Human communication does not occur in a vacuum. Here it is vitally important that means and goals, communication and its mode, remain in close contact. "It is genuine communication," writes Emil Brunner, "which remains bound to the act of communication." Biblical religion and liturgical life are built upon this foundation. I would propose the thesis that *human becoming and identity are also founded upon the close association of communication and its relevant participatory mode*. Specifically I suggest that such basic communication as perception, feeling, and evaluation is shaped by and, in turn, shapes the ego as it acquires such basic modalities as language, identity, and the capacity for play. The remainder of this paper will consist of an examination of this thesis.

In accordance with our thesis we should begin not with such primary acquisitions as perception, feeling, and evaluation as if they were abstracted functions, but with the communion (or the total environment) and its symbolic processes within which these acts of communication are possible. Perception, feeling and evaluation are always shaped by their prior wholes. They are

¹⁰ "Mouth, Hand and Ego-Integration," *The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child* (New York: International Universities Press, 1949) III/IV, pp. 56-59.

differentiations within a gestalt. Another way of saying this is to say that *what is communicated is dictated in large measure by the culture within which communication takes place*. It is said that some jungle people of South America, distinguished for their use of rare detail in Rorschach tests, have acquired their capacity as a function of their need to observe their surroundings in the struggle for survival. Again the "overuse" of space responses by Samoans in the same test reflects "simply the special cultural value attached to the color white."¹¹ It follows that the specific *Mitwelt* in which we live—its attitudes toward child rearing, its acceptance or rejection of the body, its characteristic rituals and gestures—not only shapes the values which we perceive but also selects in some measure *what* we perceive. As a chaplain on Okinawa I was always surprised by the nonchalance with which the Okinawan children approached medical inoculations. Apparently our perception of pain is subject to strong social selection.

The fact that cultural forms of communication exist at all depends upon the unique capacity of the human being to translate his experience into symbolic processes. Ernst Cassirer in *An Essay on Man* suggests that this is, indeed, the uniqueness of man. Above all he is an *animal symbolicum*. Between the receptor and the effector systems, Cassirer holds, there is a third system, the symbolic, which translates raw experience into meaningful reality available for our participation. In the light of this inner creativity, this capacity for making and using symbols, it would seem to follow conclusively both that (1) man may never be fully understood as a passive recipient of actions (but also as an initiator of actions), and (2) that his primary disturbances, while not exclusive of biology, are in the area of his symbols and their communication.

We are saying that although the symbolic processes which are the givens in any culture operate by way of coloring and shaping basic perception, these same symbols are also reshaped by the irreducible creativity of man. Indeed, one might go further by saying that man is not only an *animal symbolicum* but also one who is constantly reshaping his symbols in terms of their relevance to his concrete experience of ultimate or vital concern. An experience in clinical pastoral training is, perhaps, relevant here. Recently a student in training complained that a patient who had apparently expressed fear of death during a brief pastoral call, "ran away from the issue" when the student by extra effort arranged to see him for a longer period. "But what *did* he talk about?" the student was asked. "Oh, he went into a tirade

¹¹ Both of these illustrations are taken from *Culture, Psychiatry, and Human Values*, by Marvin K. Opler (Springfield: Charles Thomas, 1956).

against a sister who always got things fouled up," the trainee replied, "and about a mother who never took anything calmly, and a father who never seemed to care!" The words were hardly out of his mouth when the student added, "But maybe he was spelling out the hopelessness of his own life which is worse than the fear of death which I had expected."

Paul Tillich has said that the "substance of culture is religion and the form of religion is culture."¹² This definition makes it possible to view religion as a universal discrete function which is not confined to ecclesiastical institutions. Religion is evidenced not necessarily in what men say but in what they *do* with their communication. From early childhood the symbolic process becomes the bearer of religious meaning. Here knowing and doing, communication and participation, are intimately related. A clue to the initiation of this process is provided in the primary model of communication and in Erikson's¹³ additions to the Freudian theory of psychosexual development. You may remember that Erikson added an evaluative alternative as a means of judging the outcome of each developmental period. Hence the alternatives for the oral stage are trust or mistrust. For the anal period it is autonomy or shame and doubt. The genital development issues in a struggle between self-initiative or guilt. I have suggested that in terms of the *actional response* necessary for being and becoming at each stage, the Freudian orientations could be translated into *receiving, giving, and relating*. Being and becoming for the infant requires one thing: a receiving. A little later as he gathers momentum within the social whole the child is required to give as well as to receive. Even later with the awakening of sexual uniqueness one begins to learn that he becomes himself by means of intimate and personal relationship. Each means of becoming is incorporated *within*, rather than replaced by, its subsequent modes. Now if the self is an integer at every level as well as a participant in the wholes toward which it tends, it seems evident to me that the process which we have been describing is in fact *stages on man's journey toward his ultimate identity under God*. In this light I would prefer to define religion as man's numinous response to gift in his depths—gift from a source which is wholly other than himself and yet strangely kin to himself. Remembering the primary mode of communication, could we not give assent to the analogy of the great Swiss educator, Pestalozzi, namely, that God is our nearest relative! The practice of religion in this view then becomes the celebration of gift giving.

¹² *The Interpretation of History* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1936), p. 14.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, chapter 7, "Eight Stages of Man."

The human capacity for the employment of symbol provides the opportunity to participate in *conceptual reality* as well as in *religious truth*. Indeed, it seems to me that one of the most serious problems of religious life is that of *holding conceptual theology in close proximity to religious practice*. They belong in *creative tension*. Because both are transcendent products of the symbolic process they easily become isolated from living reality. Creeds as well as rituals have a way of decaying when they become *mere* symbols. Here the empirical emphasis upon the biological rootage of human intelligence is both corrective and significant. Is not the natural origin of instrumentality in human development *also* the source of man's capacity to develop and to employ sacrament? The very young child hardly recognizes his own hand. But as time goes on the hand with fingers and thumb alike becomes more and more interesting to him. Finally somewhere around the third month the hand takes the form of a definite object for the child, and now, with fingers and thumb in juxtaposition, he is able to hold, shape, and to manipulate other objects. Here, apparently, is the origin of technology. Is it not also the way sacraments are shaped? Every sacrament is also an instrument both in origin and in functioning.

The strategic function of the symbolic system between the registering and intentional capacities of the human being results not only in his ability to use discursive (or conceptual) and representational reason, but also to employ all of them in the centered act of communication. Let us conclude by looking at this relation briefly, *first* in terms of perception, feeling, and evaluation and *then* in language, identity, and play.

PERCEPTION, FEELING, AND EVALUATION

(1) Perception is a continuing reminder that our knowing is dependent upon our bodies. Jean Piaget, who perhaps more than any other living human being has spent his life observing children, holds that intelligence is rooted in biology. "Verbal and cogitative intelligence," he writes, "is based on practical or sensory motor intelligence which in turn depends on acquired and recombined habits and association. . . ." ¹⁴ It is interesting, however, that whether it be sucking and vision, phonation and hearing, or any other perceptual source, the observer is faced with the fact that primal raw experience does not give rise to perception until its random-like quality is given meaning either by another who sees this activity as a quest for satisfaction and

¹⁴ *Biology and Knowledge* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971) p. 86.

acts accordingly, or by the maturation of corollary functions.¹⁵ Piaget says that the organism must apprehend any external data within the functions of coherence. In this sense it seems to be quite literally true that one must believe in order to know—or perhaps more accurately one must believe through another in order to know.

(2) Feeling represents the difference between the spoken word and the written word. We have noted earlier that the very young child is entirely dependent upon nonverbal empathic communication. If the eye is the organ of perception in general, certainly the ear is the organ for nuances of feeling. Indeed, Harry Stack Sullivan used to say that the main clues to meaning are via the ears—even in adults. When we recall that it is not until about the seventh month that the child can distinguish between mother and stranger, we get some notion of the crucial importance of feeling and empathy during this early period. The child is without the comforting sense of time and space. Even hope—the privilege of adult transcendence—and the alleviation of time are denied him. Without these familiar tests for reality, the adult could not long retain his sanity. In addition, the child is suspended in and subject to parental moods which are not frequently mindful of their crucial importance. Surely here Lewis Sherrill's words ring with an imperative: "The emotional life of the individual as infant and child determines the kind of religion which he can respond to and make his own."¹⁶ One might even go further by adding that the feeling tones provided especially during the first six months of life are highly significant for the child's enduring attitudes toward himself (and thus toward others). Freud recognized this period as one of "primary narcissism." Another word which describes the same condition is *idolatry*. Certainly many observers believe that it is here that the self-image receives its initial shaping whether of numinous omnipotence or of anxious self-rejection. It is also here that the problem of guilt (around the child's ambivalent attitude toward the mother) begins to appear. And here again it is the mother who, by her genuine contrition for failing to satisfy the child on all occasions, reaches into his isolation by guilt and restores him to communion.

(3) Evaluation is certainly present from birth largely derived from parental attitudes. As a goal, however, it is a constant reminder that the purpose of child rearing is the gradual

¹⁵ For instance, according to Piaget, perception of light is present from birth, but in order for it to have meaning (i.e., be a perception of an object) other visual schemata must develop.

¹⁶ *The Struggle of the Soul* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1951) p. 42.

and appropriate assumption of evaluation within the person. Sprott in writing about *Human Groups* notes that "standards have two aspects; they are frameworks of expectation and measures of esteem." *The disturbed child is one whose framework of expectation has affected negatively his own measures of esteem.* In this connection Erikson has said that Luther was both psychologically and ideologically right when he said in theological terms "that the infant has faith if his community means his baptism." *The growing capacity of the child to take upon himself the responsibility for evaluation and choice remains as one of the miracles of human community.* The freedom of the individual, its goal and justification, is as Albert Outler has written, "the mode by which he (i.e., man) responds to the infinite."

LANGUAGE, IDENTITY, AND PLAY

When we turn to such acquisitions as language, identity, and play we are struck by the fact that the symbolic process has already fashioned the tools which the growing freedom of the ego is now able to use.

Malinowski holds that the learning of language consists in the development of a system of conditioned reflexes which at the same time become conditioned stimuli. *Language is an instrument which is forged in the fundamental social climate of man.* George Mead said that language is "verbal gesture." It is intimately related to the emergence of the self which is called out through gesture, response, and resultant action. For the child, to be sure, there remains an intimate relation between word and action. Language, like other aspects of culture, is an instrumental reality. It comes into existence in order to satisfy specific needs. It extends the range of the individual's effectiveness as well as his power of action. Above all, it offers the promise of communication. "Man's capacity for speech," writes Emil Brunner, "is intended by the Creator as receptivity for His Word." Man is *imago verbi divini*. His deepest knowledge is translated by the Word of God into knowledge for action.

Self-identity is profoundly related to the acquisition of language and, as we have seen, to the quality of communication. From the earliest time the emergent center of the person—his selfhood—is a gift which comes in response to prior gifts. The self, as Hume showed, is not a substance but a *relationship*. It is a linkage of past and future (by anticipation) in this moment of deciding and acting. Hence *becoming*, in a sense, *involves acquiring a memory—a history which is perceived, felt, and evaluated.* The dramatic moment in any psychotherapy is the breakthrough signaling the return of memory. And memory in man is

always more than a mere recollection of the past. It is *anamnesis* beyond *amnesia*. It is history—and history is always event plus meaning. Cassirer says that memory in man “is not simply a repetition, but rather a rebirth of the past; it implies a creative and constructive process.”

“To be a self,” writes H. Richard Niebuhr, “is to have a God; to have a God is to have a history, that is, events connected in a meaningful pattern; to have one God is to have one history. God and the history of selves in community belong together in inseparable union.”¹⁷ Personal identity is both the fruit and the means of human becoming. As John MacMurry has said, “In the strict sense of the term only a person can ‘act’ or in the proper sense ‘do’ anything.”¹⁸

Play is the child’s way of dealing with experience by creating model situations in which he is able to master reality by experiment and planning. It follows that the child, like the adult, reveals himself in play. It is here that the child in relation to all the new challenges of existence is continually recapitulating his whole history through invention and personification. It is here that his identity and his struggle for uniqueness are reconfirmed again and again. Recently a child in therapy at St. Luke’s Hospital played and replayed with family figures which he identified as “Daddy, Mamma, and the twins,” always leaving himself out. Finally there came the day when he could identify and include himself in the family constellation.

CONCLUSION

I wonder if one helpful way of looking at *liturgy* is not to regard it as *an activity on our level which is equivalent to the child at play*. The word *liturgy* is derived from an expression which originally referred to a public duty or service of any kind. It is, indeed, the public manifestation of the inner meaning of a people’s life. It is in play that man brings together the most profound unity of his worship and work. Dance and song are woven into the pattern of adoration. Why? Because as Bergson held, action cuts the knot of “absurdity” which reason tends to attach to anything beyond itself. Play is action and commitment. The shape of the world we live in is derived not primarily from concepts, but from action. It is lived in and through our bodies, our choices, our gestures, and our liturgies—by color, shape, and sound. Each man’s existence is a drama which carries onto the stage of action the living embodiment of all that he is or believes.

¹⁷ *The Meaning of Revelation* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1941) p. 7.

¹⁸ *The Self As Agent* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957) p. 18.

The eucharistic liturgy, because it carries prayer into an act, "is and must be to some extent the expression of a conception of human life as a whole."¹⁹ Liturgy in this broader sense reveals the meaning of the child's life in and through the communication and communion which his modes of becoming provide. The child provides his own liturgy through his responses in play, and it is our task to give attention to his communication.

¹⁹ Dom G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (Westminster: Darce Press, 1945) p. XVIII.

WHERE IS PREACHING TODAY?

Earl H. Furgeson, S.T.D., Ph.D.

I.

The answers to this question which today come from the patrons and the practitioners of the preaching art are not reassuring. It is not as if preachers had inadvertently lost touch with an old friend whose renewed acquaintance they would welcome; it's more like an estranged relationship caused by mistrust and headed toward separation. The value of preaching as a distinctive function of ministry is doubted by many, and by some preaching is disowned, disinherited, and cast out.

Has not Harvey Cox reminded us that we talk too much? The Church has been seen by those outside as too much of a talking and preaching organization, hectoring people about their moral failures, hounding them for money, or dispensing quick and easy answers to questions no one is asking. "A certain amount of verbal reticence will certainly characterize the future style of Christians," says Cox.¹

Clyde Reid, adding his voice to the chorus of protest, has declared the pulpit "empty." His complaint is not so much that preachers badger their congregations as that congregations have no opportunity to talk back. As a communicational instrument, says Reid, the sermon fails; it is a monologue, a "one-way process," with "zero feedback."² Of course, Lincoln's Gettysburg Address was a "zero feedback" performance also, which seems not to have hampered its effectiveness.

A long-range study of the attitudes of ministers in five major denominations has revealed that "a widespread feeling exists that preaching as a method of presenting the gospel has lost much influence." 60.4 percent of the ministers surveyed agreed that preaching is not taken as seriously as it used to be, and 77 percent of the ministers who are not in pastoral service agreed.³

Helmut Thielicke, writing from the background of the European situation, affirms that preaching has "disintegrated to the point where it is close to the stage of dying."⁴

Dr. Furgeson is Professor of Preaching and Pastoral Theology at Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C. He has published articles on preaching and pastoral care in numerous periodicals, including *The Christian Century*, *Religion and Life*, *Pastoral Psychology*, *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, and *The New Christian Advocate*. This article was originally presented to chaplains attending the First US Army Homiletics Institute in April 1972.

¹ *On Not Leaving it to the Snake* (New York: Macmillan, 1964-67) pp. 142-43.

² *The Empty Pulpit* (New York: Harper and Row, 1967) pp. 80, 102.

³ *The Christian Advocate*, May 28, 1970, p. 11.

⁴ *The Trouble With the Church* (New York: Harper & Row, 1965) tr. by John Doberstein, pp. 1-2.

A Navy Chaplain in the United States offers his own formulation of this widespread feeling of discontent with preaching. He says:

In 1950 the Methodist Church gave me the licensed privilege to preach to her congregations. A thousand sermons later I finally gave myself the duty to communicate to people. . . . I became converted from proclamation to communication, from letters to life, from rhetoric to reality—in short from homiletics to humans.⁵

The growing literature of complaint comes to one conclusion: For whatever reasons, the vote on preaching is a vote of no confidence.

Why this gouty condition? Why these dismal reports from the diagnosticians and the doctors of divinity who sit at the bedside of the Church reporting her aches and fevers? They would have us believe that the condition is critical, the prognosis problematic, and the possibility of death not to be ruled out. What has happened in our time to deliver us into the bondage of such a crisis?

So many things have happened in the twentieth century, and we are so much a part of them, that we are not well qualified as historians to identify the causative factors; we lack the perspective of time. From the vantage point of a distant future, the twentieth century will undoubtedly be described as wild, irrational, and full of wonders. The technology which enabled man to escape the earth, explore the planets, and walk on the moon also produced the ecological maladjustments and the depersonalizing conditions associated with a mass-production economy and a marketing orientation. Urbanization contributed to the breakdown of communities and to dislocations in the primary associations of the home, the school, and the Church. Agricultural and neighborhood communities, with a parish Church at the center of life, gave way to urban and sub-urban noncommunities which nourished estrangement and eroded the sense of belonging. The "lonely crowd" displaced the neighborhood and sought to overcome the despair of anonymity by the rediscovery of old idolatries. The communications revolution put commercialized television in every living room and transformed the world into a tribal village by intensifying everyone's awareness of the conflict and disorder of the world. Violence was displayed before the eyes and minds of children, whose parents had thoughtlessly turned them over to T.V. for baby sitting. The wildness of human disorder, documented and amplified, spilled over on the living room rug, destroying whatever illusion of security a former age

⁵ Dennis C. Kinlaw, "Sermon Innovation," Wesley Seminary: Unpublished MS.

might have enjoyed by being remote from the struggle, because now no one could escape it. Cities burning, people killing and being killed, warfare and revolution served up as a substitute for family prayers and grace at meals—such things, the hallmarks of the insanity of the sane, have been, and continue to be, an inescapable part of the life of our time.

In this century also the cries for liberation went up in full chorus from all sides. Black people and poor people demanded an end to exploitation and freedom from hunger and degradation. Young people and students, nauseated by the pretensions of the adult world, forsook their homes to live on the streets, marching to demand freedom from traditional values and an end to an “immoral” war in Southeast Asia. Women renounced the kitchen, the nursery, and the Church and took to the streets demanding liberation. Obviously, it has not been a quiet time. The President of the United States called for a lowering of our voices and his faithful friend, Arthur Burns, Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, lamented the noise and the tramp of marching feet, especially women’s feet. In the classic understatement of the century, he said, “If things would only quiet down!”⁶

Many a preacher shares his bewilderment. If a preacher had anything to say, it would be a poor time to say it. With everyone talking, who could possibly be listening? The more excitable ones in our profession have felt that the old forms and the old party lines have suddenly become anachronistic. The old words do not address the new situation, and it would be better, therefore, to stop talking, spread out into the world, choose up sides, and put the body on the line. One churchman, reviewing the revolution from above the battle, prophesied that it would not be long until theological seminary training would be shortened to about an 18-month grooming of a sociological task force; that knowledge and awareness of God’s presence would be a thing of the past; and that the preaching of the Word would be all but extinct.

II.

Surely all these fits, fevers, and convulsions of a revolutionary age, in which we have the misfortune or the good fortune to be alive, have something to say to us who have formed the habit of having so much to say to the world. One of the messages, loud enough for the deaf to hear, is that the preacher who has nothing to say to this age will certainly be turned off by it—and sooner than he thinks. But there is a hopeful feedback in this negative

⁶ *Time*, March 20, 1972.

response: the fires of revolution are likely to purge the pulpit of its dross. Just as the burning of a field or forest may rid it of its parasites and diseases, so may the fires of revolution produce a refinement and a relevance in the words addressed to the world from the pulpit. The whirlwinds of cultural revolution may blow into oblivion the lifeless, useless homiletical pretensions which have been too generously subsidized and too long endured. Why should a preacher expect the Church (or the world) to provide him with a protected pulpit where he can stand, "six feet above criticism," while he indulges in monophonic communications or dispenses half-baked politics, half-cooked therapies, or privatized theologies? No one else who addresses the public expects such armor-plated protection, nor does anyone receive it! One of the things our age is saying to its preachers is that they are not going to receive it either.

In light of that, it is not the least surprising to see preachers, and students preparing for preaching, turning their backs on the battle and retreating to more secure positions. A primal instinct tells them that he who cannot stand the heat does not belong in the kitchen. So the exodus from the pulpit is on; clerics are shopping around for all kinds of substitutionary activity, in specialized ministries, in social action, in pseudo-therapeutic endeavors or bureaucratic appointments, which taken all together add a considerable increment to the secularization of religion, the sabotaging of the religious establishment, and the abandonment of the gathered congregation with its need to hear a proclamation of the Word of God. What is to become of this hysterical running around when there is no longer any place to run to? Will the apologetics of accommodation then have accomplished the dissolution of the Church's identity? Perhaps only God knows. One thing, however, is clear: neither escapism nor a secularization of the holy is the preacher's answer to the world's demand for relevant address to the crisis of our age.

A second thing which these wild and wonderful times tell us is that there is nothing new about social and cultural change; there have been times like this before. In fact, Christianity was born in an age like this and to that age Jesus "came preaching." He encountered human poverty and wretchedness, the lust for power and the pretensions of piety in their more malignant forms—and he did not run away. He preached, proclaiming the coming of God's Kingdom as the answer to the kingdoms of this world. His preaching had in it a medicine which that age, or any age, needed. Our Lord's opening sermon in Nazareth proclaimed "release to the captives" and a "setting at liberty them that are bruised."⁷ All four Gospels bear consistent witness to

Jesus' mission as a preaching mission. The little group who gathered around him were sent out in pairs to preach.⁸ As the Church grew in numbers it also grew in responsibilities but these were not allowed to displace the function of preaching, and arrangements were made for the Apostles to be left free "for the preaching of the Word of God."⁹ The clear report from history of the earliest years of the Church's life is that preaching was one of the basic functions of every Church group described in the New Testament.

From this beginning the Gospel was carried by preachers to the peoples of the Mediterranean basin and beyond, fulfilling the great commission of the Lord to go into all the world and "make disciples of all nations."¹⁰ Even if we subtract from the record the details of hallowed tradition, the trustworthy fact is that those whom Jesus sent out to preach were associated with the founding of most of the major churches in the eastern half of the Mediterranean world. When social change, like a whirlwind, struck that world with its decaying structures, when the barbarians descended upon it and reduced it to rubble, the Church was on hand as a receiver to accept the bankruptcy of the Roman Empire and to preserve the hope of man for a better life under God.

In these troubled times when both preaching and the Church seem to be under a cloud, it is well to remember that our ancestors, the apostolic preachers, apologists, and martyrs, were a pillar of fire by night (sometimes quite literally) in the darkness of that troubled time. They paid a price for the privilege of being God's spokesmen.

By the light of burning martyrs,
Christ, thy bleeding feet we track,
Toiling up new Calvaries ever
With the cross that turns not back.

Our opportunities and challenges are as great as theirs, and our persecutions are as nothing in comparison.

A third thing of which this tumultuous time should remind us is that the preachers of any age are the ones who are called to hear within the tumult the mighty roll of the drums of God. The political ideals of freedom, justice, and equality which underlie the civil life of democratic peoples are not unrelated to the Gospel's affirmation of the equality of all men before God and the brotherhood of all races in the family of God—a Gospel entrusted

⁷ Luke 4:18 (RSV).

⁸ Matthew 10:5f; Luke 9:1f.

⁹ Acts 6:2.

¹⁰ Matthew 28:201.

by God to His Church to be proclaimed, preserved, and propagated by the preachers of the Church.

In the Apostolic period, the preachers heard within the tumult the mighty roll of the drums of God, and the Gospel they proclaimed drew together small groups of believers in which the foundations of personal and social rejuvenation were laid. Because men were equal in the sight of God they became equally free under God. The walls of separation, between master and slave, rich and poor, Gentile and Jew, were breached and all, regardless of race, class, or nation, were brought into fellowship with Christ and with each other. The power of the preached Word and the life in communities of faith created by the Word became the matrix of new life in a dead and decaying order. The light struggled with the darkness and the darkness was not able to overcome it.

If the preaching of the Word formed the Church in the beginning, it re-formed it in the years that were to follow. The prophetic preaching of Savonarola and the preaching friars of the orders of St. Dominicus and St. Francis, wandering all over Europe, propagated the Gospel and purged the Church in the same way that, in a later time, the preaching of Luther, Calvin, Knox, Wesley and others ushered in a Reformation, which opened the way for the Counter-Reformation and the work of Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus. If the Wesleyan revival promoted peaceful reform in England, as some have thought, the work of the Jesuit priests and preachers kindled a fervor in the Church and produced missionary accomplishments in all quarters of the world, surpassing the missionary activities of any other Church.

Whatever the historians may say about the motives which led to the colonization of America, one fact they will have to report is that preaching played no small part in the accomplishment of the operation. The sermons preached to the small groups who set out in frail boats against the open sea to grasp a foothold in a hostile and foreign land must have been a strong support for the incredible courage required for survival. As John Wesley said to one of his preachers in England, George Shadford, "Dear George, the time has arrived for you to embark for America. Publish your message in the open face of the sun, and do all the good you can."¹¹ The steadying influence of their preachers pervaded the lives of the colonists in time of danger and gave direction to their civil life, at least on Election

¹¹ Quoted by Harold Bosley, "The Role of Preaching in American History" in *Preaching in American History*. DeWitte Holland, ed., (Nashville; Abingdon Press 1969).

Day when a preacher was expected to deliver a scripturally based sermon admonishing voters and warning candidates of the kind of men required to govern after the examples of David and Solomon.

The great revivals which swept the American colonies in the 18th century would have been impossible without the forceful preaching of men like George Whitefield, William and Gilbert Tennent, Jonathan Edwards, William Robinson, Theodore Frelinghuysen, Samuel Davies, and Devereaux Jarrett. These left-wing Protestant revivals were not merely the stirrings of emotional enthusiasm; they were an impetus to educational advancement and social reforms.¹²

The entire story is not, of course, a narrative of sweetness and light. The regrettable Protestant-Roman conflict was transplanted from the Old World to the New, and the frontier preachers won for themselves no laurels in toleration. Although they were unanimous in their concern for preserving the moral principles involved in the issues of their day, their disagreements generated denominational divisions in profusion up to the period of the Civil War. In the clash of interests over the complex questions of slavery, freedom, and states' rights, not to mention theological and cultural tensions, serious divisions could probably not have been avoided. The lesson from the preachers of that time to the preachers of our time, who still face many of the same problems, is a lesson on the importance of finding that fine line which affirms the absoluteness of moral concern on the one hand without reducing the Church and the Gospel to a condition of partisan activism on the other. The word which establishes the position of the Church and her preachers is the New Testament word, *reconciliation*. God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself and we are become the agents of His reconciliation.

As long as the Church maintains her identity as a people of God entrusted with the life-giving Word of God, the proclamation of that Word will continue as long as the Church lasts, and preachers will come forward, called of God to be His heralds and the servants of His Word. But if the Church should lose her identity and become completely secularized, she will perish with the culture that produced her. It is the Gospel which generates both preaching and the Church. As P.T. Forsyth has said, "With preaching, Christianity stands or falls because it is the declaration of a Gospel. . . . It is the Gospel prolonging and declaring itself."¹³

¹² Cf. William Warren Sweet. *Religion in Colonial America* (Abingdon, 1942) and *The American Churches* (Abingdon, 1948).

¹³ *Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind* (New York: Eaton & Mains, not dated) p. 5.

III.

What then is a sermon? Homiletical textbooks taken together will provide a basketful of definitions. If we said that a sermon is an oral address to the congregation or to the world on a religious truth drawn from the Scriptures and related to life, with a view to persuasion, we would be within the main stream of historical thinking on the subject; but it would be better for our purposes to rise above the particularities of precise definition and ask in a more general way, what is a sermon? Ecologically speaking, a sermon is, or at least has been, a primary function of the life of a Christian community—a vocal expression of the people of God of a Word given them through the self-revealing activity of God, a Word by which they are judged, into which they are baptized, and through which they are saved. The obligation of a Christian community is to proclaim this Word, audibly, visibly, actively. The audible proclamation of the Word is what a sermon is—or is intended to be.

John Wesley, founder of the branch of the Church to which the writer belongs, saw the Church as composed of three essential elements: a living faith, without which there can be no Church at all; preaching, because without a hearing of the pure Word of God faith would languish and die; and the sacraments duly administered. Or, as he put it, the Church is “a congregation of faithful men (and women) in which the pure Word of God is preached and the sacraments duly administered.” As a symptom of the sickness of the Church in our time, we might note in passing that this is a definition of the Church which is *not* preferred by most Methodists today. They prefer to think of the Church as “a society of those who have joined together in their quest for the religious life,” presumably on the assumption that the substance of the religious life can be generated out of the empirical or privatized forms of individual or communal experience, as a spider would generate her web out of her own insides.

In any event, the definitions of preaching are clearly derived from and dependent upon one's conception of the Church. If the Church is the household of God or the body of Christ it then becomes a beloved community or the fellowship of those redeemed by the reconciling love of God and brought under the mandate of Christ by baptism into his name for the purpose of becoming co-workers with God in the redemption of the world. The members of the household of God lead their lives under a three-fold purpose:

1. They must interact with their own history and tradition for the purpose of maintaining their identity,

2. They must interact with each other in such ways as to clarify the present expression of their identity, and

3. They must interact with the world in their own time and place as "God's colony in the world" for the purpose of cooperative labor with God in the redemption of the world.¹⁴

It seems obvious that this triple form of interaction which characterizes the life of the believing community requires the services of trained leaders qualified, with the help of God, to equip the community for the understanding of their faith, the regulation of their life and the support of their apostolate to the world. Without those priestly, pastoral, didactic, evangelical and proclamational activities which are the blood, bone and sinew of the clerical office, the life of the believing community could not be sustained, nor could God's redemptive activity be effectively carried on.

If we ask where preaching fits into all this, the answer is clear: preaching is the total response of the people of God to the Word from God; it is the expression of the personal and communal life of the people of God in the time and place which they occupy in history; preaching identifies and articulates the thought, the will, and the deed of the believing community under their mandate to become coworkers with God in the redemption of the world.

IV.

In the light of this theological definition and against the background of history, where, we ask, is preaching today? The answer is that preaching is in crisis; it faces the danger of being taken captive by the cultural situation, which is itself in crisis. The cultural crisis, which is the contemporary setting for preaching, seems to swirl around two familiar poles: the situation of man as a person and the situation of man in society. Secular messiahs bid for the soul of man with gospels related to one or the other of these two poles. Since the time of Sigmund Freud the secular order has produced a massive movement called psychotherapy as the answer to man's personal predicament, and since the time of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels the secular order has produced a world-wide revolutionary movement called Communism, which is a totalitarian socio-religious movement with atheistic orientation offered as the answer to man's socio-economic predicament. The Church has not yet assimilated the impact of these two upheavals, either in its theological thought forms or in its practical actions; the responses have been more imitative than

¹⁴ Cf. C. Ellis Nelson, *Where Faith Begins* (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1967) for an excellent elucidation and defense of this view.

integrative; and the church's rebuttal has been more reactive than responsive, as a result of the fact, no doubt, that the corpus of faith and life to which the Church had become accustomed was not sufficiently adaptable to provide a synoptic response to the new challenges which would be consistent with the Church's basic faith and life. By default, therefore, it is understandable that the Church's preachers, who always face life on the frontiers, should be drawn away into the ways of the world.

With the glorious religious unity of medieval culture completely disrupted, with powerful secular messiahs bidding for the salvation of man's individual soul on the analyst's couch and other messiahs bidding for the salvation of man's societies through blood-red revolution, and with the ministers of the Church hearing one secular voice or the other and exchanging their identities as ministers for new identities as psychotherapists or social activists, is it any wonder that we present to the world and to ourselves the spectacle of a house divided? The Church has always faced the problem of how to be *in* the world without being *of* the world and has not always solved the problem well because it is not an easy problem to solve. To listen to the world without being seduced by it is an art which the preachers who face the world today find almost impossible to solve. Some of us, therefore, end up in jail charged with crimes of violence against the political order; others can be found in more secluded places practicing psychotherapy without a license under the guise of pastoral counseling. But where is the whole man who can listen to the world and respond as God's man under the whole counsel of God, one who can assume the pastoral leadership of the people of God as one charged with maintaining the beloved community and equipping the saints for their work in the world? Where is that person? That description of the ministerial office will have too much of the aroma of establishmentarianism about it to make it tolerable for many, and they will either withdraw from the establishment or spend their energies trying to make the sacred establishment over into some kind of mirror image of the secular order.

To put the matter bluntly, we preachers allow ourselves to be used. Instead of striving for a holistic point of view grounded in faith and history, with which we could fulfill our calling to equip the people of God for their work in the world, we become apologists for segmental secular gospels seeking out those ephemeral frontiers which at the moment identify where the action is. We lack the grounding in faith and commitment which characterized the Apologists in the second century of the Church's life. Their distinction was that they could out-think the secular messiahs and critics of their own time and were able, on that

account, to speak to the world that saving Word entrusted to the keeping of the household of God. Today the communications seem to run the other way; the heavy weapons are on the other side.

CONCLUSION

Perhaps the basic question then is not, where is preaching to-day, but where is *my* preaching today? The jaundiced condition of preaching can be cured by any preacher who is willing to pay the cost of the medicine. G.K. Chesterton once remarked that Christianity has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and not tried. We might say the same for preaching: it has not been tried and found wanting; it has been found difficult and given up. The times being what they are, this may be understandable; but the times are what they have always been—a rough passage between the eternity out of which we came and the eternity into which we go. And preaching, being a part of this passage, is today where it has always been—in a situation of crisis between God and the world. But a crisis is a time both of opportunity and of danger.

George Bernard Shaw gave us a memorable picture of the danger and the opportunity so far as preaching is concerned. Some preaching, he said, is like wine; it has color and sparkle, but does no permanent good; some is like coffee; it stimulates, but does not nourish; some is like carbonated water, a fuss over nothing; some is like spring water, good, but hard to get.

He that hath ears to hear, let him hear.

HISTORICAL NOTES

MEMORIAL CHAPEL—FORT MYER, VIRGINIA



- The new Memorial Chapel at Fort Myer, Virginia, was dedicated on 12 December 1971. The Secretary of the Army, the Honorable Robert F. Froehlke, gave the dedicatory address. The 660 seat chapel was designed by Pietro Belluschi of the Rockville, Maryland firm of Johnson and Boutin and cost \$775,000.
- Chaplain (Major General) Luther D. Miller, USA Retired, Army Chief of Chaplains from 1945 to 1949, passed away on 27 April 1972 in Washington, D.C. He is survived by his wife, Cornelia G. Miller, a daughter, Mrs. Theodore Herdey of Fort Sam Houston, Texas, and a son, The Reverend Luther D. Miller, Jr., of St. David's Episcopal Church in Washington, D.C. The funeral service was held on 1 May 1972 in the Fort Myer Post Chapel, with interment in Arlington National Cemetery.
- Chaplain (Brigadier General) James H. O'Neill, USA Retired, Deputy Chief of Chaplains from 26 July 1948 to 31 January 1952, passed away on 17 April 1972 and was buried on 20 April 1972 at Sacred Heart Cathedral, Pueblo, Colorado. When he was Third Army Chaplain in 1944, Chaplain O'Neill wrote the now famous "Patton Prayer."
- The US Army Chaplain Board and the US Army Chaplain School have entered the field of video cassette recording. The television equipment and video recorders will allow experimentation in the area of innovative forms of worship, professional development and religious education. The Chaplain Board will loan its equipment on a rotating basis to chapels in the First Army area for experimentation by chaplains and directors of religious education.
- The US Army Chaplain School announced that 74 of 91 students in the Advanced Course have earned Master's Degrees from Long Island University—54 in Guidance and Counseling and 20 in Sociology. Most of the other students already had Master's Degrees or were working in other advanced degree programs.
- On 1 June 1972 Dr. Martin H. Scharlemann of Concordia Theological Seminary, St. Louis, Missouri, led an all-day seminar at Fort Carson, Colorado, on the subject "The Moral Issues of War." Among the topics discussed were the legitimacy of the military profession, the right of self-defense and the nature of pacifism.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS

Name _____

Old Address _____

New Address _____

Send to:

Military Chaplains' Review
US Army Chaplain Board
Fort George G. Meade, MD 20755

MILITARY CHAPLAINS' REVIEW AUGUST 1972

